

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. XLVII

JULY, 1949

NO. 1039

Persecution in Hungary

JOHN COGLEY

*Reprinted from TODAY**

"We easily forget that the Church of Jesus Christ is the Church of the Cross, that it was seeded in the blood of its Founder and of His apostles. As the Church is the natural home of the saint, so is it also the natural home of the martyr. It never remains for long without martyrs. Our times have produced an abundant harvest . . . those who suffer persecution for justice's sake. Among a throng of more or less nameless believers, whom God alone knows, the great figure of Cardinal Mindszenty stands out like a captain leading his soldiers in combat, where a force from on high assures victory even in the midst of defeat.

"The duty of those who have not yet known persecution is to pray for those of their brothers who have already proved themselves; to pray for all the victims of a system of government which, rejecting the love of God, cannot help but be cruel; to pray for the persecutors themselves,

whom the crucified Saviour has included in His mercy. Particularly should all those who call themselves Christian conform their lives, public and private, with the profession of their faith. Thus can we honor the man who today has won the admiration of the civilized world . . ."

FRANCOIS CHARRIERE

Bishop of Lausanne-Geneva-Fribourg

WHEN the Russians first came into Catholic Hungary, they were under orders from Moscow to treat the priests and religious with consideration and kindness. The Hungarians are profoundly religious, and it was part of the communist strategy not to antagonize the population. The Russian army was ordered to spare church buildings as much as possible and to make a show of friendliness toward the leaders of the Church.

These orders were generally

obeyed. There was one incident at the time, but it was due entirely to the muddled malice of a drunken soldier. The bishop of Győr, a Monsignor Apor, had hidden a group of refugee women in his house and tried to protect them from a group of lusty soldiers. A drunken Russian, maddened by the bishop's stubborn care of the women, drew his gun in anger. The bishop died. But this was an isolated instance, the sort of thing that can happen whenever there are soldiers and a war. At the time it was certainly not a matter of official policy.

When the first post-war government was set up, it was housed in the private offices of the Bishop of Veszprém, Monsignor Banas, a churchman who was later the Government's choice to succeed the old Primate, Archbishop Saredi. But Bishop Banas was not the people's choice. They were for Josef Mindszenty, the young prelate who had dramatically stood up to the Nazis and had become a national symbol of high-hearted resistance.

OFFICE OF PRIMATE

In Catholic Hungary, the office of Primate is a dignity respected by all. Traditionally, the Primate had been *ipso facto* chancellor and the third personality in the country, right after the king and the "Nador." In times of calamity the Hungarians, always a religious people, traditionally

turned for leadership to the head of the Church. After the war, it was the overwhelming will of the people that the honor of Primate be given to Mindszenty, a man who had proved his patriotism and courage. Rome respected the popular feeling. Mindszenty was named Primate, though the new masters of Hungary didn't like the idea.

Of course, there was no sincerity in this early treatment of the Church. It was part of the over-all strategy. Communism concentrates on destroying the weak first and then coming round in time to the strong. In all Hungary, the Catholic Church was the strongest moral and popular force. It was only when the communists had destroyed lesser opposition, had grown in power themselves and had time to consolidate their political position that they began to show their real feelings. They were ready then, they thought, to take on the Church.

From the beginning, Government measures against the Church have been wrapped in cloudy phrases. The Hungarian bosses never say that they are out to destroy the Church or to kill religion as a living influence in the life of the nation. No, they speak about "regulating relations between Church and State," talk about "democratizing the Church" and "suppressing its political character." They use the patois of politics rather than the truer, more specific language of

theology: persecution and martyrdom, suffering and death.

The Hungarian Government has always spoken of itself as trying to work on "friendly" terms and as hoping that "peaceful means" will be found to settle differences. By "friendly" terms it means terms that have already been drawn up on a unilateral basis and presented for formal signature. This kind of "friendly" intercourse is like a friendly bank robbery: the terms are strictly one-sided. When they are presented, the matter in question is usually an accomplished fact. The bank robber stands with the loot in his hands, asking if a "friendly" agreement can't be reached.

DEMANDS

The first demands the Government made of the Church were five in number:

1. The Church was ordered to recognize "popular democracy" as the true, legal government of Hungary, publicly and officially.
2. The Church was ordered to approve specifically of the agrarian reforms and the nationalization program.
3. The Church was ordered to "democratize" itself—to change its hierarchical structure and conform to the government's notions of what constitutes "democracy." In cruder words, it was ordered to let itself become an instrument of the State.
4. The Church was ordered to turn over its schools and houses of education, with all their equipment,

to the Government. In return, the Government promised to keep the same teaching personnel, including the priests and religious, and to turn over the direction of certain "historic" confessional high schools to the Church. The Government also promised to keep religious teaching obligatory in the schools.

5. The Church was ordered to accept separation of Church and State in regard to finances. A twenty-year plan was outlined. During the first five years the financial contribution of the Government to the Church would be the same as it was during the preceding year. Then there would be a reduction of twenty-five per cent every five years. At the end of twenty years, the State would discontinue all financial contributions.

The Church answered promptly with dignity and firmness:

1. It is not the business of the Church to give legal recognition to a government, nor for that matter to deny its legal status. It is the Church's business to take a position on whatever affects faith, morals or religious life. Up to this point, the Church has been very indulgent in thus judging the present Government because of the early difficulties it faced in shattered Hungary.

2. The thought of the Church on the distribution of land and the "nationalization" of social and economic life is found in the papal encyclicals for all the world to read. The just distribution of this world's goods is an old principle of the Church.

3. This intolerable demand the

Church did not dignify with a reply.

4. The Church will not renounce the right to teach and to run schools. It has received from God Himself the charge to "go, teach all nations."

5. The financial contributions of the State to the Church are not a gift. The Government has confiscated Church property and has not made the returns legally fixed. The revenue from the forest-property of the Church, property which has *not* been distributed to the peasants but has been kept by the Government for itself, is a much greater sum than the State gives the Church annually for its needs.

By such a reply, the Hungarian Church stood to lose everything but its honor and integrity. There were even some sincere Catholics who thought that an answer so brusque and uncompromising was less than prudent. The Church, they thought, would have done better to strike a more "diplomatic" note. But a straightforward, uncompromising position was the only realistic, honor-saving position the Church could take. Promises, the Church knew, meant nothing. The demands made (and they would be only the beginning) were part of an over-all strategy directed from Moscow. With communism, tactics may swerve and shift but basic strategy remains unchanged.

The Government answered with deeds. The communist war on the Church in Hungary began in earnest.

The first phase was marked by the State claiming the cultural and social

institutions of the Church. Libraries, museums, clubhouses and everything in them had to be turned over to the Government. "We'll manage these things now for the good of the people," the red bosses told the Church.

Then came the dissolution of the Catholic youth organizations and the suppression of Catholic workers' associations. Through these groups, the communists knew, the teachings of Catholicism were being given expression in public and social life.

Then the Government turned on the Catholic schools. There were a series of sudden suppressions. A "political plot" had been discovered in a school, it was explained, so it was necessary to close it down. In many cases, arms and munitions were hidden in school buildings by Government agents, then a few hours later were dramatically discovered by the same men who had put them where they were. These phony "plots" were sufficient reason to jail professors and students: part of a terror-campaign to get the schools to close down voluntarily.

NEW TECHNIQUE

One morning the director of the Catholic college at Baja read in the paper that a great plot had been discovered in his college and that many students had been arrested. Their names were listed. The director hurried to the campus but found everything peaceful and orderly; the students he had read about were not in jail but peacefully sitting in their lecture-halls.

The police dossier prepared for the Baja college had fallen into the hands of a careless communist editor. He announced the arrests before the "plot" had been discovered!

Incidents like this made the whole "plot" campaign ridiculous. In a short time, the method was dropped. Someone at Government headquarters had a better idea. It was decided that the State should issue all text books. The catechism and all other Catholic texts were forbidden in all the schools. Of course, only communist books were put on the approved lists.

This didn't work out so well either. The Catholic schools accepted the books, but the teachers went ahead with their own presentations, contradicting the Marxist teachings found in the texts.

At this time, it was still possible to protest in Hungary. Terror was not yet generally being used. It was necessary first to build up a nucleus of loyal, convinced communist citizens. The masters knew that such a group could not be developed in an atmosphere of terror and police-state brutality. For the time being, sweet reason held sway.

The school-book orders brought on another wave of popular protest. Then a new tactic was tried.

Now the Church was flattered and courted. The papers were full of articles exalting the benevolence "popular democracy" showered on the Catholic Church. Battalions of communist workers were sent out to reconstruct war-damaged churches.

Rakosi, the chief communist, was photographed clasping the hand of a priest. It was during this phase, on February 23, 1948, that the Minister of Education, Mr. Ortutay, publicly proclaimed in Parliament: "Hungarian democracy, knowing the true social and historic situation of Hungary, has no intention of secularizing or nationalizing the confessional schools." Three months later he said the very opposite.

The flattery didn't last long. It was used as a breathing spell while Hungarian communism was built up and red bosses strengthened their strangle-hold on the nation.

On January 10, 1948, Rakosi openly declared his true feeling about the Church. The sweet talk melted away. "The efforts of Hungarian democracy to get the Catholic Church to participate in the reconstruction of the nation," he said, "have proved to be vain. The leaders of the Catholic Church do not recognize the republic and stand in the way of reconstruction . . . Hungarian democracy has solved all its problems so far. Now the hour has sounded in which to deal with the reaction hiding behind the Catholic Church." This was in a speech given to the Communist Party workers.

SUPPRESSION OF SCHOOLS

The first move in the new get-tough policy was the outright suppression of the Catholic schools and of Catholic charities. First there was a big build-up in the press. All the arguments for a unified school sys-

tem, conducted by the Government, of course, were hashed over and re-hashed. It was reported that students went into the Catholic schools with democratic ideas and were perverted into becoming reactionaries and anti-democrats after they got there. There were long lists of teachers who had been dismissed from Catholic schools and of the students who had been expelled. They were victims, the Government said, of the Catholic reactionaries. They had been thrown out of the schools only because they believed in democracy.

The Catholic weekly paper, *Uj Ember*, took up the challenge. It made a thorough investigation of every dismissal that had been listed. Then it published the same list, giving the true story: this student was expelled because of bad marks; this professor for drunkenness; this one for immorality; this one for inefficiency, etc. The Hungarian people remained loyal to the confessional schools. The Government tried to get a unanimous resolution in the state council calling for the closing of the schools, but a woman member, Margaret Schlacta, had the courage to speak out and make public protest against the measure.

In all, 4,882 Catholic schools (about 65 per cent of the total number of schools in the country) were taken over by the Government. No compensation for the buildings was given to the Church, which had built them.

RESTRICTIONS

After the war, the Social Section of Hungarian Catholic Action had taken over the direction of certain charitable works. This work of Catholic Action was concerned mainly with the poor and with needy children. More than a half-million Hungarians were fed daily at 126 kitchens, mainly through help that came from Switzerland and the United States.

Early in 1948, fifty-seven box cars of food and clothes arrived in Hungary from the U. S. The War Relief Service of the NCWC in Washington sent Father Fabian Flynn, an American priest, as its delegate to present the collection to Hungarian Catholic Action for distribution to the needy. But the Government would not authorize the distribution unless eighty per cent of the total was turned over to it. Father Flynn would make no such agreement. Then the Government came down ten per cent. It would be satisfied with only seventenths. Father Flynn argued patiently with the representatives of "popular democracy." But eventually he had to leave the country. He is still classified as an "undesirable" in Hungary and would not be given a return visa if ever he wanted one.

One by one the Catholic charity kitchens were closed down. One hundred and ten cars of food and clothing waiting in the depots of Hungary were never unloaded. Why? Because the Government wanted to see to it that the Church had no contact with the masses of poor Hungarians. It

wouldn't do for the Church to be giving man his daily bread. For the same reason, "*Monsieur Vincent*," the French movie about St. Vincent de Paul, cannot be shown in Hungary. It would show the Church's concern for the material needs of man and accent the brotherly love which down through the centuries has characterized Catholicism.

The next move was to restrict religious activities to church buildings only. Public processions and religious congresses, always popular in Hungary, were officially "discouraged." A police permit became necessary for any public out-door religious service. By means of delays and annoying vexations, the Church was discouraged from asking for them. There was always some good reason found why a procession-permit should not be given.

The restriction of religious services to ecclesiastical buildings only, also included laws against people standing outside of churches, on steps, and in church squares, during Mass on Sunday. Hungarian churches were always crowded, but now it was

forbidden to remain for Mass if one didn't find a seat.

Then religious societies of laymen, like the St. Vincent de Paul Society, were denounced regularly as dangerous to the State. It was argued in the press and over the radio that their suppression was absolutely necessary. Every day there were lists published of societies which "spontaneously" broke up because their members did not want to "serve Mindszenty" as an instrument for opposing democracy.

"Democratizing" the Catholic clergy did not work out. In other words, the majority of the priests, by far most of them, could not be subdued into timid, shameful subservience, by turning the Church itself into an instrument and servant of "popular democracy." So the Government, following the familiar pattern, began the extermination of the clergy. Now every week two or three priests are arrested, with no legal procedure, for "sabotage" or "anti-democratic" activities.

Cardinal Mindszenty is not alone. His trial was only the beginning.

Minimum Wages on the Farm

"Admittedly difficulties exist in guaranteeing minimum wage rates to agricultural labor. These are neither as great nor as insurmountable as is sometimes supposed. A start might be made . . . by extending minimum wage guarantees to workers on Class I farms, employing four or more workers. Such farms have an annual gross product of \$20,000 or more. There are approximately 100,000 such farms, a small percentage of the total, but their employees represent a considerable portion of the farm workers who are not self-employed."—*National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa, May 19, 1949.*

The Catholic Labor School

REV. WILLIAM J. SMITH, S.J.

Director, Crown Heights Catholic Labor School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

*Reprinted from THE APOSTLE**

CASIMIR KOWALSKI used to hurry home from the plant every Monday and Wednesday night to get into his Sunday duds for his date with the girl friend. Now he has shifted date-night to Tuesdays and Thursdays. Stella, his steady-best, has a rival. A Catholic Labor School got under way and Casimir joined up.

Sometimes Stella goes with him to the classes. But both of them think it's a swell idea and Stella isn't jealous at all about the competition.

Pat McGuire, who spent most of his life in the drudgery of a mill and had been content in late years to relax of an evening with his pipe, the evening paper and a half-gallon of beer, is a member of the "student body," too. He finds it a little bit hard to keep up with the younger fellows but he enjoys the discussions on labor unions, collective bargaining, that "slave-labor" law and the like. He sits there in quiet amusement or with serious interest and wishes they had something like this "when he was younger."

Old Mrs. Hoffman is very happy about the new School. Her Georgie had always been pretty much of a problem child to her. When he quit school after the second year in high school and got in the automobile fac-

tory, she worried a lot about him. He had joined what they called the CIO and pretty soon all the old neighbors were calling him a "radical." She didn't know exactly what it meant but she could see that they didn't like it and so she had her doubts about it, too.

But now Father Kubak tells her that Georgie is all right. He is alert and progressive and he is battling the Communists in his union. Maybe he didn't do very well with the books and studies at Harlan High, but this is different. He is really learning the right answers to a good many problems that even some of the big, prominent people do not seem to understand. It is a bit confusing to her but, if the priest says it is all right and that Georgie really isn't a "radical" at all, she'll take the priest's word for it and just not pay too much attention to what the neighbors say.

It all started because the Pope wrote a letter to the whole world about seventeen years ago. The Vicar of Christ stated bluntly that it is about time his Catholic children stopped talking about what the enemies of the Church are doing to souls in the world and got busy doing something about the situation themselves.

Today the Catholic Labor School

* P. O. Box 87, Detroit 31, Mich., March, 1949

is no longer a theory, an experiment, a hope or a dream. It is a fact that is contributing a vital influence to Catholic action in a thousand places. The movement takes different shapes and forms in various parts of the country, but basically it is a definite effort on the part of energetic Catholics to reduce Catholic social principles to the most effective practical level.

The results are not yet world-shaking in their effectiveness and the techniques are still far from perfect. But a tremendous beginning has been made. Something definite has been stirred and started in a field where little had been done before.

The movement is based on an educational program and as everybody knows, "knowledge maketh a bloody entrance."

It is hard work—this Labor School experience. It takes time and talent and patience and perseverance. For some reason or other, American Catholics, until recent years, did not seem to be fully awakened to the need and the possibilities of sustained study and unrelenting action to meet the threats and challenges that face the Church and the world in this day of unrestricted "liberalism."

The Kowalskis, the Hoffmans and the McGuires trudging out to the Catholic Labor School, week after week, are pioneering in a modern program through which it is hoped a new spirit may be infused into the soul of industrial relations.

A number of groups are engaged

in the work. The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, one of the pioneer organizations, is an active and enthusiastic part of it. The Catholic Labor Alliance in Chicago and Father Rice's crusaders in Pittsburgh and Father Drolet in New Orleans are all following the fundamental pattern, cutting the cloth to fit the circumstances of local conditions.

DIOCESAN SPONSORSHIP

Under the sponsorship of diocesan authorities, Labor Schools and Industrial Institutes are springing up in every section of America. Monsignor Boland in Buffalo, Father Joe Donnelly in Hartford, Father William Kelly in Brooklyn, Father O'Connell in the South, everywhere—in dozens of dioceses—the ferment of Catholic social action is showing itself under the general title of what people are calling the Catholic Labor School.

Among the first to display active leadership in the movement were some of the institutions of the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits.

As a matter of fact, away back in 1910, Father Terence Shealy, S.J., pioneer promoter of the laymen's retreat movement, had a very clear idea of what was needed. He dreamed of a School of Social Studies affiliated with and conducted side by side with every retreat house for men. He actually put the plan into operation in Manhattan and Brooklyn as far as his limited resources would allow for his day.

It is amazing to read the printed

circulars put out by Father Shealy in 1911 and compare them with a schedule of the modern Catholic Labor School. With but little modification, his curriculum could be used today. But, like so many others, Father Shealy suffered the fate of the far-sighted pioneer who was forty years ahead of his time.

Nevertheless, today Xavier Labor School in New York City, Rockhurst Institute of Industrial Relations, Kansas City, Holy Cross Institute in Worcester, Mass., Crown Heights Associated Activities, Brooklyn, are familiar names in this field of Catholic Social Action. All across the country, wherever a Jesuit College or High School functions, with a few exceptions, some kind of an Institute of this type is in operation.

We single out the Jesuit Labor School at the specific request of the editor of the *Apostle*. Two of them, close by, showing definite signs of success and permanency, can be taken as typical.

Xavier Labor School in Manhattan and St. Peter's College Institute of Industrial Relations, Jersey City, are really going great guns. Fathers Philip Carey, S.J., and John M. Corridan, S.J., conduct the Manhattan project and Father Philip Dobson S.J., formerly attached to Crown Heights in Brooklyn as Associate Director of activities, is making his presence felt as head of the St. Peter's College unit in Jersey City. All three display the quiet dynamism that has come to be recognized as characteristic of the so-called "labor" priest.

You can get an idea of the contents of the courses taught by running through the printed schedules. The spirit, atmosphere and the informal approach of the School, however, is unique. You have to experience it to appreciate it, though you can catch some indication of it from the efforts of a writer in describing it.

Casimir Kowalski, Pat McGuire, Georgie Hoffman and a host of men like them run into something like this when they sign up: a hundred, two hundred, perhaps three hundred working men are milling around in a corridor of some school building waiting for a bell to ring at eight o'clock in the evening. (In some places women workers are also welcome.) The bell booms somewhere in the building and the men and women break into smaller groups and head for a class room.

NO ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS

The "gang" is back again as "pupils," but how different it is. Few if any text books are in sight. There is no homework. No "notes from mother" when you are late or absent. Tests and examinations are kept to a minimum, if any are held at all. You can get a certificate at the end of the year for a successfully completed course, but there are no credits or academic requirements demanded. Nor is there any charge for courses.

The lawyer, the personnel agent and the truck driver who left school after the sixth grade are now all on a par. And surprisingly enough, very often you find very little difference in their

abili
A
teer
the
spea
majo
parli
first
ing
prac
sion
The
train
Ever
teur
lear
you
fess
nos
Sch
and
agi
S
pro
suc
tio
the
pro
to
ra
lu
ic
to
Th
Pl
G
T
U
P

ability to take in what is going on.

A priest or a competent lay volunteer instructor usually presides over the class-room work. If it is public speaking, the students are soon the major actors in the whole scene. In parliamentary procedure, after the first night, the chairman of the meeting is a volunteer from the class and practically all the talking and discussion is carried on by the students. There is fun as well as fundamental training found in the experience. Every one in attendance is an "amateur." You make your mistakes and learn the techniques with a "gang" of your own kind and there are no professionals around to look down their noses at you. This angle of the Labor School work is the most stimulating and most productive of results imaginable.

Some of the Schools are able to provide only a course or two. Others such as Xavier and St. Peter's, mentioned above, really go to town on their schedules and offer as varied a program as any college might hope to present.

COURSES OFFERED

Take a look at this array taken at random from Father Carey's curriculum for 1948: Present-day Economics, Contract Negotiations, Labor History, Taft-Hartley Law, Job Analysis, The Worker and Government, The Philosophy of Right Living, The Grievance Clinic, Shop Stewards, The Worker and the Law, Trade Union Methods, Prices, Wages and Profits, The Philosophy of Labor,

Preparing an Arbitration Case, Industrial Psychology, Labor Journalism, Social and Economic Problems of Europe, Public Speaking, Parliamentary Procedure.

You might think from a casual glance at that formidable lineup of subjects that the man in overalls would get jittery and shy away from it. He "eats it up." The secret is not in the title given to the courses but the easy-going, give-and-take, informal presentation of the subject. It is a policy and a principle of the Catholic Labor School that the teacher "does as little talking as possible." By questions and discussions the whole class is made a part of the faculty.

The Casimir Kowalskis and the Georgie Hoffmans are encouraged to educate one another by "putting in their two cents worth" whenever the spirit moves them. In no time the problem is not to get the worker-student to express an opinion but to limit his contribution of vocal wisdom, so that an orderly understanding of the subject may be had in spite of the spontaneous participation urged upon the pupil.

It is at this point that the tact, competency and experience of the teacher shows itself most. It is in the art of putting across very definite ideas to the class without resorting to the "straight lecture" technique that the role of the Labor School instructor differs most from that of the formal educator in the colleges.

In Jersey City, Father Dobson's curriculum parallels the Xavier pro-

gram in many respects. An added feature of the St. Peter's approach has been the ability of the Director to corral a sizeable group of men from the side of management, on the same night and often in the same classroom with the workers. That is the dream of every Catholic Labor School Director and a number of the Schools have been able to make it a reality. It is proving successful and mutually profitable in Jersey City.

The classroom work, however, is but one aspect of the activity. Every registered student brings with him potential problems. Conditions in his union, his shop, relationships with the boss and his fellow workers, often personal problems of many kinds are soon dumped in the lap of the Director and his associates. The extra-curricular conferences and activities are often a far heavier burden than the actual conducting of the School. That is why any one experienced in the field immediately tells a prospective inquirer that it is a "full-time" job.

WORKER APOSTLES

Days of Recollection, week-end retreats, the traditional Labor Day Mass, here and there a holy hour are some of the spiritual exercises that have been introduced as complementary functions of the Catholic Labor School. The ultimate objective of the work is to form leaders imbued with Christian principles who will carry on their industrial relations with motives of high idealism. Every effort is made to avoid any appearance of a "Sunday School."

From the practical angle, the permanency of this movement will depend, we believe, on the ability of the Director to establish a competent committee or board made up of the worker-students themselves. The success of the lay retreat movement is due in no small measure to the group-captains who constantly take it upon themselves to round up retreatants year after year. The same need of the worker to be the apostle to the worker is apparent in the Labor School movement.

To date too often the entire enterprise revolves around the personality of the Director. If he is changed or for some reason can not give his full energies to the job, the work suffers. A continuing committee of the students themselves goes a long way in protecting the permanency of the organization. From experience it has also been learned that some of the best instructors come from the "alumni" among the worker-students.

No one would be so rash as to predict that this infant effort in social action is the panacea of industrial peace for which the world has been waiting. The issues are too complicated, the present relationships have become too hardened, the factors involved are too far-flung, for anyone to hope that one single agency will provide the universal remedy.

The most that might be expected is that the Catholic Labor School may be the inspiration and the impetus to bestir Catholic employers and employes, in proportion to their numbers, to contribute an energetic and

vital i
they w
The
nature
most
enough
action
dicts
cialist
opolis
namis
and c

of
to
ca
in
an
th
w
it
p
in
p

h
lo
p
c
l
A

vital influence to the world in which they work and live.

The Catholic social doctrine on the nature of industrial society is the most radical in the world. It has enough dynamite in it to blow all reactionary attitudes to bits. It contradicts not only Communism and Socialism but is quite contrary to monopolistic Capitalism as well. Its dynamism, however, will lie dormant and of little use as long as the doc-

trine is kept concealed between the covers of a textbook. It must be transformed into challenging thoughts and militant action in the lives of the faithful.

It was the hope of achieving that objective which gave birth to the Catholic Labor School. The gradual fulfillment of that hope is the one thing that can insure its further growth, development and final, full-blown maturity.

Integrity in Politics

The true Christian—whatever others may say about the requirements of party or pressure—will learn that as a public official he must be sure to keep inviolate the sacred sovereignty of his soul. No one in public life can plead for himself a blameless ignorance of the requirements of morality in our day, and indeed there are very few for whom anyone else may plead it, and with this removed what other excuse can there be found? It is true that the complications of political life are every day becoming greater, and while this makes more difficult the already complex life of the politician, it requires of him a diligence in the pursuit of good which can match the problems of his office. If the position of the man of state carries unhappily in our times a certain stigma, it is because there has been too often in public office those unworthy of its very large responsibilities.

Civil servants must be men not merely of special ability and dedication but also men of singular integrity, and without this last quality the first two lose their importance. In a democracy this whole question of morality in public life is not simply a question for the men of state to ponder on, but one requiring the self examination of every citizen, since he lives in the last analysis under a government of his own making.—BOSTON PILOT, May 14, 1949.

Detroit's Interracial Council

MARY JANE DONOVAN

Reprinted from the **INTERRACIAL REVIEW***

IT WAS the first Sunday morning in November, brisk and bright. In the heart of the crowded Negro slums of Detroit the long rows of tenements were peaceful with the strange Sabbath-quiet, and in the narrow streets that ran between there was no echo of terror, no apparent sign of the blood spilled there five years before in a riot of hate.

But old Sacred Heart Church was filled with sound: the ancient, hallowed music of the Liturgy sung by children while the congregation, black and white, prayed the Holy Sacrifice together. Later, across the street in the basement of the school, there were more noises as the pleasantries of breakfasting together were mingled with the business of learning together the economic problems a Negro faces in Detroit.

In this picture of the Catholic Interracial Council of Detroit's Communion Breakfast-Forum we see a many-sided and happy significance only suggested above. This was the first in a series of monthly forums so ably planned by Mr. Julian Wheeler, young Negro attorney active in our Council. Through this medium we are doing the most important thing to resolve the unhappy conflicts which mar the national picture of democracy held up as an example to an unhappy world: we are getting to

know each other. We are removing first among ourselves antipathies that are built on ignorance and distrust by the infallible weapon against racial prejudice: friendly familiarity and cooperation. And we are being capably instructed by prominent civic leaders in the broad and varied field of human relations so that the effort we make to better the relations among men in the Motor City will be an informed effort.

A most gratifying response to these forums has been made. We expect, with reason, to double the attendance at our January forum, and find that given an attractive enough program people are easy to interest in this apostolate considered so unpopular and discouraging.

Our series for the year covers the situations faced by the Negro in employment, recreation, housing, health, law enforcement and civil liberties. As can be already noted, our program is an educational one, and the approach is deliberately positive. The only purpose in our public discussion is to illuminate facts with a view to stimulating action. We consider prejudice in an adult Christian mind not a crime which must be punished, but a vacuum which must be filled, and injustice toward the Negro not food for an attitude of antagonistic grievance, but a reason

* 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y., January, 1949

for cheery and tactful *doing*. Our meetings are free of the sombre air of "necessary business"; the atmosphere is warm with the friendly enjoyment which grows over the coffee cups before the formality of lecture begins. We explain the increased attendance at the public part of this year's program over that at last year's evening one-person lectures at least partially by the dual influence of first praying together at Mass and then sharing a friendly meal. That old reserve which is only partially dispelled by a speaker's words melts quite successfully where not only the spirit but the whole man is fed. Certainly we profit much from formal instruction in, e.g., the legal technicalities of restrictive covenants, but the whole matter becomes quite effectively personal when a few persons can discuss together what is involved when a Negro first moves into a white neighborhood, as the salt for the scrambled eggs moves along through a series of vari-colored hands.

PANEL OF SPEAKERS

The forums are conducted by a panel of speakers who invite questions from the audience after their own discussions. Only one request is made of those who attend: bring someone else next time. The truly cosmopolitan group we are accumulating proves a very real persuasion to others and we envision further large jumps in attendance. Ordinarily we meet in different local churches which have facilities in their schools for serving us, but our only

worry at present—and quite a grateful one—is that we are outgrowing many of these spots whose hospitality we have enjoyed.

We have a Speakers' Bureau operating somewhat haphazardly at present, but several talks, some accompanied with the graphic impressions offered by films, have been given both to student and adult groups this year. Between 1944 and 1946 this Bureau was much more active, and with only three speakers gave sixty-six lectures to over 30,000 persons in schools and clubs. From their experience grew the fine and widely used pamphlet, "Race Riddles," embodying brief and adequate answers to the questions most commonly asked regarding race relations.

To supplement the information made available at our forums, (with a view to greatly enlarging our Speakers' Bureau especially) we are initiating this month a Workshop which will consist of several talks and compulsory attendance for Council members, offering training in the techniques of spreading a message and handling a group. For this we shall have several instructors from among Detroit priests particularly equipped in this field. This augmentation of our educational effort is based on the discovery that many really interested people know less than enough about the shape and scope of the problem itself, which knowledge is basic to consideration of the solutions suggested in our forums. And most people are quite untrained in the arts of public speaking and group action. We aim to make

every person attending our meetings a vigorous apostle, and think his interest untested and somewhat sterile until he *uses* the information and experience gained, on the principle that the apostolate is not a schoolhouse where we sit quietly to be taught but a workshop where we labor. One must not be content with lighting one little candle when he has been sent to spread fire on the earth. We cherish the spirit of warmth among our members—it is the initial inspiration—but we aim at a zeal like flame, for only from fiery *action* comes any real achievement.

(We observe how the persistent zeal of Communists has succeeded in enlisting the support of many Negroes and yet know we have the better equipment in the fight for interracial justice if we are but willing to use it, for "Love is as strong as death.")

WORKSHOP GIVES ANSWER

The Workshop will give us the answer to the primary question: why all this bother in the first place? It will furnish the scientific viewpoint regarding the bugbears of the alleged Negro mental and moral inferiority, threats of sterile descendants from miscegenation, the true significance of Negro history, etc. It will consider the philosophic bases for action in Justice (economic and social) and Charity (the responsibilities inherent in our common spiritual intimacy in the Mystical Body). And it will conclude with practicable answers to the key question: what should we do?

Detroit is the first city in the country to make race relations the

business of government. After our infamous race riots former Mayor Edward Jeffries set up in 1943 the Mayor's Interracial Committee, staffed by eight paid workers and advised by a Board represented by six City Department heads and five prominent civilians. This group now has as Chairman Father John E. Coogan, S.J., of the University of Detroit, long prominent in interracial work. The Mayor's Committee is largely responsible for the improved conditions in Detroit since its inception. They have a wide program embodying particularly education, investigation, and active conciliation in situations of racial conflict. One original technique they employ very successfully is their Friendship Tours, on which a trained worker conducts an interested group on an inspection of the Negro areas of the city, beginning in the inhuman degradation of the slums (Detroiters are astounded to find outside toilet facilities and their many dreadful concomitants within walking distance of the City Hall) and ending with a visit at the home of an established Negro family which is an implicit disproof of the "Negroes-deteriorate-property" myth.

Affiliated with the new Mayor's Committee is the Coordinating Council on Human Relations, composed of picked representatives of all large organizations or associations in Detroit professionally or privately interested in intercultural relations. The Catholic Interracial Council is represented in this group.

The Catholic Interracial Council of Detroit was founded early in 1942

under
Mar
Thie
and
mal
pres
Aw
the
suc
now
hun
the
wor
wit
the

under the patronage of Blessed Martin de Porres, by Father Henry Thiefels, C. S. Sp., Charles Rawlings and John May, and had about nine male members. Mr. Rawlings, our present president, holds the Hoey Award for his work in the field. To the efforts of Mr. May we owe the success of our fine monthly Bulletin, now disseminated to about eight hundred persons. About a year ago the newer and previously separate women's group was amalgamated with the parent Council. We enjoy the approbation and sponsorship of

the Archdiocesan Office of Detroit.

Admittedly, in view of the possibilities in Detroit, the Catholic Interracial Council here has made only a beginning. The harvest is of fabulous scope and the laborers in pathetic disproportion. But we have high hopes for making the Catholic influence felt locally in the interracial picture, and are grateful for the success we have known. St. Francis de Sales explained perfectly what motives vivify our action: "Where there is no love, put love—and you shall find love."



Affability

It seems fairly evident that man cannot live in human society and do his part toward a healthy social life, unless he is truthful. It should be equally obvious that he cannot live in society without pleasure. His very nature as a social being demands that he not only live with others, but that he live pleasantly with others.

The virtue regulating this decent agreement in social relations among men is friendliness or affability. As a part of justice, it deals with externals, with the signs of courtesy and amiability. It does not demand internal love for others, for internal love, which is a determination of the will to do good to others, is the work of love. But it does demand that we treat others with respect, decently, pleasantly and agreeably.—INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD, May 13, 1949.

Catholicism in Scandinavia

FROM A SWEDISH CORRESPONDENT

Reprinted from THE TABLET*

IN THE Catholic community of the world the Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland, form a geographical and intellectual unity. These countries are under the jurisdiction of the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*. They are classed with the mission-lands. But from an historical and cultural point of view they belong to Western Europe and form a greater unity than any other group of Powers in Europe.

The Danish, Swedish and Norwegian languages are so akin that the inhabitants of those countries are able to understand each other. Norway and Denmark were a political unity until 1814, Norway and Sweden until 1905, and the southern part of Sweden (Skaane), with the archbishopric of Lund, was part of Denmark throughout the Middle Ages. Although Finland belonged to Russia until 1917, as an autonomous grand-duchy, this had no influence upon the Western mood of the people. Finland is a "*sentinelle avancée de la Chrétienté*" (an advanced sentinel of Christianity), says Jarl Gallen. Because the Catholic history of the North formed a unity in the Middle Ages, the Scandinavian countries fell away from the Church almost simultaneously, and in much the same way, when the Reformation started. Today, in an area which is almost as big as France,

Spain and Italy together, 35 thousand Catholics are living among 16 million Protestants.

No valley remained Catholic after the Reformation, as in Scotland. No family is found in Scandinavia with an unbroken Catholic tradition, as in England. Modern Catholic history in Scandinavia has its beginning in the middle of the last century. And in Denmark only, can one speak about a fairly lively Catholic tradition. As a residence of the ambassadors of the Catholic Powers, Copenhagen had a small Catholic community in the seventeenth century, and today the Catholics of the other Scandinavian countries look on Copenhagen, with its 9,000 Catholics among one million inhabitants, its churches and chapels, as a "Catholic" city. When Denmark got religious freedom in 1849, only 800 Catholics lived there. At the beginning of this century they numbered about 5,000. These numbers tell not of a mass-conversion but of a steady increase. In Sweden the intolerance of the public and the laws made it very difficult to care for the Catholic immigrants. The position in Norway was almost the same as in Sweden. Norwegian law still forbids membership of the Society of Jesus, on pain of death. In Finland Catholic mission-work was started in 1906.

Though the number of Catholics is

* 128 Sloane St., London, S.W. 1, England, Oct. 2, 1948

insignificant, they take a certain part in cultural life because they are representatives of the world-wide Catholic Church, because as a rule they live exclusively in the towns, and because they number some intellectuals, such as the well-known Danish poet Johannes Jorgensen and the Nobel prize-winner Sigrid Undset. At first Protestant circles met them with distrust. Their position may be compared with the position that Newman described in *The Present Position of Catholics in England*. In Sweden they were regarded as pariahs, but at present they enjoy almost the same rights as their Protestant fellow-citizens, and are able to use their strength in the service of the Church and their respective countries. Some restrictions which may still be found will without doubt be removed very soon, although growing materialism and dechristianization cause a lot of difficulties and anxieties.

CHURCH TAKES ROOT

When in 1939 the Pope named a Dane, Fr. Theodor Suhr, O.S.B., to be successor to the Belgian Bishop Brems, it was clear that the Catholic Church in Denmark had struck root again and that nobody must speak again about the Catholic Church as a foreign and outlandish Church. Bishop Suhr, who was born in 1896, entered the Order of St. Benedict after his conversion, and before his appointment he was Prior of the Abbey of San Girolamo in Rome. About 90 priests are working among the 22,000 Catholics of Denmark, and more than

a fourth of this number are natives of Denmark. The priests are assisted by a great many Orders of nuns, the largest of which is the Sisterhood of St. Joseph de Chambery.

Catholic theology arouses fairly general interest. In Sweden in 1944 a thesis for a doctor's degree, *Kunskap och verklighet* by Lechard Johannesson, discussed Thomism. In 1947, Rudolf Johannesson, of the University of Lund, defended a thesis that deals without prejudice with the difference between Catholic and Lutheran theology. In Denmark the professor of dogmatic theology (Lutheran) at the University of Copenhagen, K. E. Skydsgaard, has written a valuable thesis about Neo-Thomism, which has made the Neo-Thomist movement known in this country. Catholic theologians are invited to be opponents. Maritain is read. Books of his are translated both into Danish and Swedish. The Catholic literature of other countries is well read—Bernanos, Claudel, Chesterton, Dawson, Graham Greene, Evelyn Waugh.

The most urgent problem is to adjust Catholics to the northern mode of life. Our generation has the task of making the Catholic view familiar in the Scandinavian countries. For a long time Catholicism was a foreign affair. Much help and strength may be found in the Catholic history of the Middle Ages. The broken traditions are to be restored in order to give the Catholic truth a home. On the other hand, it is of great importance that our Catholics may make contact with those of other countries.

By doing so the Scandinavian Catholics will discover that many an actual problem has already been discussed and solved. Before World War II, the Catholic Church in Scandinavia was influenced mainly by the Catholic Church in Germany. It may be hoped that the English-speaking countries will now take the lead. If the doors are opened, the Church will be regarded not as an historic relic but as the most important organization of our time. *Pax Romana* is here of great importance. The visit of Cardinal Griffin to Copenhagen last December was also very important. Economic weakness is a great handicap. The Scandinavian Catholics need invitations to study at Catholic universities, they need exchange students, they need the visits of outstanding intellectual or political personalities. This has been begun since the war ended. For isolation means danger for the Scandinavian Catholics, the greatest obstacle to the spread of their faith.

CHANGE FOR THE BETTER

Some twenty years ago public opinion was very strongly against Catholicism, but this has changed greatly for the better now. The well-known Protestant prejudices are disappearing, and the Church is being met, in the Press and elsewhere, with a new respect. This change in public opinion is a consequence of the fact that on the whole the judgment of Catholicism between the first and second World Wars has undergone a change. But it depends also on the

important factor that the Catholics in Denmark—and so far the same thing is to be said about other Scandinavian countries, especially Norway—have been able to synthesize Scandinavian culture and the Catholic idea into one unity. By his quiet, continuous work the well-known Danish poet and convert Johannes Jorgensen has rendered the Catholic cause a great service. He analyzes the problem in this way:

"Isolation or adjustment is our problem, which we, both Catholics by birth and converts, have faced. . . . Catholic immigrants often lose their power of resistance when transplanted into northern milieu . . . Our religion cannot survive on a lot of exceptions—not going to the Protestant services, not doing the things which others consider allowed. We must do something positive—not only more or less indifferent things which are considered forbidden by rigorous Protestants. Catholicism as a view on the world can not be isolated from reality. On many accounts we are nearer to the northern Catholics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries than to the Catholics of France, Holland and Italy. We must not forget that we must not plant an exotic herb, but must ingraft a stem with a Catholic branch, since the stem formerly carried rich Catholic flowers. When some days ago we stood in front of St. Brigid's shrine, and yesterday in front of the remains of the main altar in the Church of Alvastra, it was not only an act of piety or historic interest. We came into touch with people who lived in this world as we do, who

were northern Catholics as we, who have finished their pilgrimage which we still have to finish; people who look upon us, pray for us as their descendants. . . . The sleeping tradition of our Middle Ages contains an untouched capital—a jotting in *The-saurus Ecclesiae*—the gift of grace

of the Church. The union of the classic Catholic idea with the genuine northern idea solves our problem of culture, in liturgy and the veneration of the Saints, in a realization of the ideals of the religious life, in the growth of a northern Catholic vocabulary."



Church and State

"Absolute separation of Church and State, as advocated by many American Protestants, is not a Protestant doctrine at all. It is not taught as a Protestant doctrine by Protestant authorities in Europe. It is for the most part no more than a political slogan adopted by people in this country who are more afraid that the Catholic Church will prosper than that irreligion and even communism will sweep over this country.

"State aid to religious education, far from being a threat to religious liberty, is necessary to protect that liberty and is so understood in great Protestant democracies like the Netherlands, Great Britain and Canada. In fact, no democracy in the world, outside of the United States, regards the teaching of religion by 'sectarian' groups, in the public schools and during school hours, as a threat to religious freedom."—*Robert C. Hartnett, S.J., at the Sheil School of Social Sciences, April 22, 1949.*



Guardians of Truth

"In the history of Christian thought, supreme and triumphant reaffirmations of the Truth have followed the deepest descents into error. The greatest teachers of the Church have defended her against things mankind generally forgets, and which only the universal and never-failing memory of the Church recalls at such critical moments of the world's history, when the old error reappears under some new name or new disguise."—*Bela Menczer in the DUBLIN REVIEW, Spring, 1949.*

Subsidized Housing

RT. REV. MSCR. JOHN O'GRADY

Statement of the Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, considering Housing Legislation, February 18, 1949.

AFTER a campaign lasting for more than eighteen years the principle of subsidized public housing for low-income groups has become generally accepted throughout the United States. The people as a whole are satisfied that families cannot be permitted to live in unsanitary slum houses. They are convinced that decent family life is not possible under these conditions. The people are satisfied that we need a larger volume of public low-rent houses.

Through the years, I have been associated with the movement for public housing for low-income groups. I have witnessed most of the struggles through which the movement has passed. It has been a great experience in developing in the consciousness of the American people a wide and deep interest in one of the greatest social problems of our time. Not only have the veteran and labor organizations developed a keen interest in public housing but also the various religious groups and practically all the great national civic and social groups.

In the past three years interest in public housing has become especially keen. Colleges and universities have added it to their teaching programs. Nearly all the great social and civic groups in American communities

have included it in their platform. During these past years most of us who have been active in this movement have developed a consciousness of sharing in a great national social movement.

Those of us who have been interested in marginal farmers in small towns and rural communities have been glad to see the increasing interest in providing decent housing for them. We recognize the great contribution that has been made by the Farm Security Administration and its successor, the Farmers Home Administration, in improving the standards of life of the marginal farm families of our country. We know that those who have been interested in improving the standard of life of our marginal families in the country will welcome the provision that the proposed housing legislation makes for rural communities.

One cannot very well think of housing for rural families as something separate and independent from their whole economy. Housing for the rural family is part of its farm plan. The farmer may need help in building or repairing his house just as he will need help in building his barn, his chicken houses and his hog pens.

The Farmers Home Administration is greatly handicapped by the limita-

tions attached to its loans made to rural families. It is limited by the total amount available for loans and also by the limit placed on the loan that can be made to the individual farmer. The proposed legislation should enable the Farmers Home Administration to spread its existing loans among a larger group of families.

The Farmers Home Administration each year is compelled to turn away a great many applications from veterans who are anxious to get started on farming. This is one of the great evidences of the pressure of the people on land in the United States at the present time. Undoubtedly this pressure will in time lead to some popular movement for more family farms.

The rural housing section of S. 138 would provide an opportunity for doing much towards improving the conditions of tenant farmers. When the owner of a farm seeks assistance for improving housing conditions for his tenants, those charged with the administration of the program can well raise questions about other things that enter into the standard of life of the tenants. There will not be much use in improving their housing conditions if they do not have any facilities for raising subsistence crops or if they do not have any security of tenure.

It is to be hoped also that those who are planning housing programs for families in small towns may be able to see to it that each house has sufficient land to enable the owner or

the tenant to raise as much as possible of his own food. This is one of the best means of improving the standard of life of workers in our small towns.

MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

I am sure that the Congress will not want to pass a housing bill without giving some consideration to housing for migratory agricultural workers. I have had an opportunity for first-hand contact with these workers in various sections of the country and I know something about the conditions under which they live. During the war the Federal Government constructed fifty-two permanent camps for migratory workers in various sections of the country. Besides these permanent camps there were a number of temporary camps, some of them of a mobile character. Congress has decided that these camps should be sold. But the matter of selling them hasn't proved to be very easy. Most of them have been leased to local growers. From what I have been able to learn, the growers aren't too keen about having to meet the deficits which will mount each year as the camps need major repairs. In a number of places the camps have been leased to local Housing Authorities set up under State law.

Any future program for housing of migratory workers will have to begin with the present camps. They might be given over to the Housing Agency to be disposed of in the same way as war housing. In time, it

would be possible to have these camps turned over to local Housing Authorities. Provision might be made to have these local Housing Authorities work with the farmers and farm operators in the further development of local housing programs.

In developing a housing program for agricultural workers it should be remembered that in many places now the agricultural workers remain in the same place throughout the entire year. They are able to dovetail their work on fruits and vegetables with other farming operations in the area.

A FIVE-YEAR OBJECTIVE

Those who are interested in public housing for low-income groups have as their objective 200,000 units a year during the next five years. They will not be satisfied with anything less. They know that even with a million units a mere beginning will have been made in providing decent housing for those who are at present living under conditions that are most detrimental to their health and welfare. It is our hope that the occupants of these new houses will not remain in them forever. We hope that as their standard of life and their earning power improve they will be able to move into houses constructed by private enterprise. It was our hope from the beginning and it is still our hope that public housing may not be a means of creating among the people a feeling of dependence on government. We hope rather that it will stimulate a new spirit of enterprise and prepare the occupants of

subsidized houses for home ownership.

One of the most insistent complaints that we have had about the low-rent public housing projects is that they have not really served the interests of low-income families. All in all, the people who have been in charge of the projects have done their very best to have them serve the needs of low-income families. Some of the war housing projects turned over to the local Housing Authorities were originally designed for the housing of war workers who belonged in higher income brackets. It was by no means easy to dispossess these war workers. The Housing Authorities did everything possible to have these projects used for housing low-income families. In July 1947, Congress, by special Act, forbade the eviction of people in the higher income brackets from the projects. This continued until August 1948. Since that time the Housing Authorities have been gradually removing families in the higher income brackets.

Anybody who looks at the situation locally cannot fail to be impressed by the rigidity of the standards set up for admission to the projects. My complaint as I move around the country has been that the Housing Authorities are too conservative in regard to the families they admit to the projects. The income levels set for admission in many instances seem to be wholly unrealistic. The Housing Authorities have failed to recognize that a thousand-dollar-a-year family in 1936 would probably be an

eighteen-hundred-dollar-a-year family today, and a fifteen-hundred-dollar-a-year family then would be a twenty-seven-hundred-dollar family today. It is only recently that the Housing Authorities have come to recognize changes in the cost of living in their admission standards. One can readily understand their timidity in this regard. They were keenly aware of the criticisms of the local builders and real estate boards. These local business interests lost no opportunity for criticizing the policies of the local public Housing Authorities.

I am well aware from my contacts with a large number of communities in the United States that the local Housing Authorities have felt a sense of responsibility for the entire housing program of their cities. This was part of their war experience. During the war they were charged with large responsibilities in the housing field and it was fortunate that we did have the Housing Authorities to take over this responsibility. Now they recognize more and more fully that they have a big job ahead in promoting and planning programs for those who cannot pay the regular economic rents. As the public housing program grows, problems of management will become more and more difficult. In the management of public housing projects Government has entered into a new field. On the whole it has learned much from experience. But there is still much to be done by both public and private agencies in finding ways to reduce costs of maintenance and operations, as well as in reducing

construction costs, through new and improved methods and techniques.

From the very beginning slum clearance and the providing of decent housing for slum dwellers have been regarded as part of the same program. It was the basic purpose of the U. S. Housing Act of 1937 to clear the slums and to provide decent housing for slum dwellers. It might not always be possible to house slum dwellers in the same area. It was not possible to build in the same density and it was necessary to make provisions for recreation and other community facilities.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

The earliest slum studies made in the United States showed that the cities were gradually losing in population at their centers. They showed in fact that the whole process of disintegration was at work in American cities. They showed that the people were leaving the downtown sections of cities and spreading out in all directions. The rapid expansion of the cities brought up many questions in regard to the cost of city government. Utilities had to be extended over wide areas that had been developed without any plan or program. The question of city planning was, therefore, given a new emphasis by developments in housing construction. The cities could not indefinitely continue to deteriorate at their centers while they spread over wider and wider areas. Housing became part and parcel of a program of city management.

It has been recognized on all sides that private enterprise never has cleared and never could clear the slums of American cities. The clearing of the slums has, therefore, become by and large a governmental function. It has been generally recognized, moreover, within the past five or six years that City and even State governments did not have the resources necessary to clear the slums. It has been recognized on all sides that the only way in which the slums can be cleared is through the aid of the Federal Government.

When slum clearance was made a part of the original Wagner-Ellender-Taft Bill, there was really no opposition to it. Those who were opposed to public housing did not raise any question about Federal Government aid in clearing the slums. The original housing bill provided for the payment by the Federal Government of two-thirds of the difference between the value of the slums and their sale value for building and other purposes after they had been cleared. It was recognized from the beginning that only a very small part of the land would be used for public housing. The remainder would be sold to private builders or other business interests or made available for the building of schools, churches and other community facilities. All this called for a new program of redevelopment in the slum areas and it soon became clear that the same kind of planning was needed in the development of newer city areas as in the reclamation of the older areas. It

was, therefore, felt that funds that were made available by the Federal Government for slum clearance and planning for the slum areas should also be used in the acquisition and planning of new areas.

PUBLIC HOUSING AS PART OF AN ENTIRE HOUSING PROGRAM

In the early days of the public housing movement its proponents felt that they should not concern themselves about a housing program for all the people. They felt that it would be far more advisable for them to confine themselves to low-income groups. They were really laying the foundations of a new program. They felt that they could get support for a program for low-income groups which might not be so easily secured for middle-income groups. There was not the same keen appreciation of the plight of the middle-income groups that we have today. The depression made us more conscious of the insecurity of middle-income groups. The loss of their entire savings invested in their homes in the early days of the depression made a Home Owners Loan Corporation necessary. The stabilization of the mortgage market as it affected middle-income groups brought the Home Loan Bank system and the Federal Housing Administration. Through these measures government was endeavoring to do something about the plight of middle-income groups. Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance and Unemployment Compensation were devised with the same objective.

It probably never occurred to the framers of the Home Owners Loan Corporation and the Home Loan Bank system that they were trying to deal with the evils of a system that needed to be radically changed. In fact, they made themselves part of the system and they are still part of it. I am afraid that too many of our Government housing officials are still thinking in terms of the horse and buggy days. A few days ago somebody handed me a pamphlet gotten out by the Federal Housing Administration. Its title is *Significant Variations in Minimum Planning Requirements of FHA Insurance Offices*. What would happen if Chrysler and Ford and Studebaker and General Motors had to have different width doors in their automobiles for every city in the United States? And yet FHA has different methods of home planning in every large city in the country. With such a mentality, it is going to be very difficult for the FHA to provide the leadership that is needed in a large program for middle-income groups in the United States.

COST OF PUBLIC HOUSING

During the course of the hearings a great deal has been made of the high cost of public housing. I understand that the average cost per unit will be \$8,000. I haven't seen anywhere in the United States in this past year a house designed for family use that cost much less than \$8,500. For instance, in 1947 the mayor of Salem, Massachusetts, said to me: "We are building duplex houses to rent to veterans at ap-

proximately \$45.00 per month, without heat. These houses cost us approximately \$19,000 each or \$9,500 per unit."

In 1947 the City of Salem built sixty houses for veterans. It provided the land at a nominal charge and all the improvements. Even with this the houses cost \$7,800 per unit. In August, 1948, the authorities of the City of Salem told me that these same houses would cost \$9,000 or more. In 1947 the City of Lawrence, Massachusetts, with a population of 75,000, decided to provide land for fifty-seven veterans families at \$25.00 a lot. It was felt that with this subsidy the veterans could build houses within their reach. Under the State law it was possible to write off a thousand dollars for depreciation during the first five years. Even with this land subsidy and the subsidy for depreciation the City was unable to provide housing for its wage earners at a price they could afford to pay. The ordinary textile worker in Lawrence has an income of \$1,500 a year.

Last fall I found that in the City of Columbus, Nebraska, with a population of a little over 15,000, the ordinary newly built house costs about \$7,800. And there were very few of them available at this price.

It is very interesting to see how far the State of Connecticut was able to get in its 1,500 units for which State credit was made available by the legislature last year. The land cost only \$43.00 a unit. Many of the houses were built on vacant sites and in many instances also land was

donated. Now the average cost per unit is \$9,600. The average shelter rents in New Haven are \$53.58. The rents in Hartford are \$51.00, in Wallingford, \$70.80, in Willimantic, \$51.96 and in Middletown, \$51.26. Remember that this is with State credit, 50-year amortization, 2¼ per cent interest. They figured that in Connecticut utilities would cost about \$18.00 a month.

CAMPAIGNING FOR LOW-RENT HOUSING

At the present time a campaign is being conducted all through the country for the so-called economy house. Those who have studied the economy house from a technical angle tell us that its cost will be reduced by sacrificing good standards of construction and space which is really necessary for the housing of a family. It is no mere coincidence that this housing campaign is being staged at the time when Congress is considering a constructive housing program designed to meet the housing of all the American people. While we hear a great deal nationally and from reading the newspapers about \$6,000 and even \$7,000 houses, we do not find many of them that are fit for family living.

In their testimony before this Committee representatives of the National Association of Home Builders have boasted of the large volume of inexpensive housing that they built during the War under Title VI of the Housing Act. Now those who move around the country know very well that many of the permanent housing units built during the War

are really becoming new slums. I have had an opportunity of visiting many of these units in different cities. The cost of maintaining them is abnormally high and they are deteriorating very rapidly. The ordinary veteran and the ordinary wage-earner need more than the promises that are being made by the real estate interests and the National Association of Home Builders at the present time. They cannot be satisfied with jerry-built houses. They need houses in which their families can live.

In studying housing for families I have been impressed by this statement from the report of the Massachusetts State Housing Board: "Forty-five per cent of the dwelling units should consist of two bedrooms and forty-five per cent, three bedrooms. Where one bedroom units are planned (they are not encouraged) they should not exceed ten per cent. Provision is also made for supplying units having as many as four bedrooms."

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

In S. 712 (81st Congress, 1st Session) Section 3 (A), (C), (D) and Section 4 are designed to meet the needs of middle-income groups. This bill is an improvement over Public Law 901, 80th Congress, which was designed to meet the needs of middle-income groups. Title II, Section 2 is a little more responsive to the possibilities of cooperative housing. It would give cooperatives more of the kind of guidance that they need. It would extend the mortgage life to 40 years at an interest rate of 4 per cent.

Apparently S. 712 is building a large part of its program around the \$7,000 house for which it would provide a 95 per cent insurance guarantee. It is also cognizant of the fact that the \$7,000 house may not be adequate to meet the needs of families. The Commissioner is, therefore, authorized to construct dwellings with three or four bedrooms and to increase the dollar limitation, not exceeding \$950 for each additional bedroom.

I am convinced that the \$7,000 house, or the provision for the stimulation of cooperatives and non-profit housing generally contained in S. 712, will not be adequate to meet the needs of middle-income groups. And what are the alternatives? Senate Bill 724 (81st Congress, 1st Session) includes the alternatives on which all the public-interest groups seem to be agreed. It includes direct Federal loans of 100 per cent to cooperatives and other non-profit organizations engaged in providing housing for their members. It includes 60 years of mortgage life and the setting up of a special constituent within the Housing and Home Finance Agency to stimulate and to provide technical guidance for cooperatives and other forms of non-profit housing. This is a step ahead of S. 712 and a step that must be taken, besides the provisions of S. 712 which would serve a higher income group.

I do not believe that the present Federal Housing Administration has sufficient interest in cooperative housing to provide the leadership that a new movement like this calls for. It

really needs a separate constituent in the Housing Agency, manned by people who believe in cooperative housing and who will conduct a real campaign to develop interest in cooperative housing throughout the country.

The new aids for cooperatives and other non-profit forms of housing are not set forth as a panacea. The problem must be attacked on other fronts. It is exceedingly doubtful if we shall ever be able to meet the problem without something that more nearly resembles mass production of houses. S. 724 includes necessary amendments to Section 609 and 611 of the National Housing Act which would stimulate the new methods and techniques we need in housing construction. In addition, it would include a firmer statement of purpose which it is hoped will give the FHA the will and drive required to carry out the purposes behind these provisions.

LEADERSHIP NEEDED

It is our hope that the new incentives that are provided for cooperative housing may make a special appeal in all communities throughout the United States. Most communities are really interested in doing something about housing but a considerable number of them have thrown up their hands because they do not know what to do. They need more leadership in the entire housing field than they are receiving and this type of leadership is especially necessary in the promotion of cooperative housing. Many communities would be willing to provide land for veterans cooperatives. They would also be

willing to provide other kinds of aids that would cut the present, inflated cost of housing.

A subsidy has been suggested by some people as a means of reaching middle-income groups. I am opposed to a subsidy for these groups. In spite of the fact that the home builders have not profited by the experience of American industry in the building of houses, I still believe that with better leadership from the Federal

Government they may be able to see the light; that they may be willing to go along in regard to the use of new materials and new methods of house building. I am still convinced that private enterprise can provide ways and means of meeting the housing needs of middle-income groups, with the additional aids which we are recommending and which are provided in the bills before this Committee.

Parity for Farmers

"To avoid overproduction or underproduction of particular commodities it is necessary that some adjustment be made periodically in the economic assistance extended to producers of various crops. The (1948) flexible price support plan was a step in this direction. The next step should be to find a satisfactory method of assuring adequate real income for farm families, without compelling urban consumers to pay excessively high prices for foods which can and should be produced in abundance. Farmers, too, must be discouraged from overproducing commodities just because prices are supported at a high level."—*National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa, May 19, 1949.*

Communist Morals

"We can and must write . . . in a language which sows among the masses hate, revulsion, scorn and the like, towards those of different thought . . . we must be ready for trickery, deceit, law-breaking, withholding and concealing the truth."—*Lenin.*

This is My Priest

DON CAPELLANO

*Reprinted from the LABOR LEADER**

THE most heartening news out of Hungary is a comment in *Time*: "there were Hungarians who even refused to listen to the radio broadcasts of the trial, believed in Mindszenty more strongly than ever. Said a Catholic worker, 'He is my priest'."

The index to the survival of the Church in Hungary is the number of the Hungarian workers who will say of their Cardinal: "He is my priest." The workers are the roots of the Church and of the nation. Destroy the workers' faith in the priestliness of the prelates and the moth and rust take over—and quickly.

THE ROOTS

There was a book, "Lovely Mary" I think was the name of it, that told about an old lady who kept what she called "a denominational garden." Each religion was represented by a typical flower or shrub. The Episcopalians were Easter lilies, for she said, "They always look best at weddings and funerals." The Catholics were flowering shrubs that to be kept healthy had to be pruned back often to the roots.

There is a weight of history on the side of this judgment. When the human needs of the people were forgotten, the people forgot the Church—and the pruning began.

The roots of the Church in Christ are the poor—particularly the poor who depend upon the social justice of the Church to defend them, the poor whose daily bread is bought by a daily wage. They are our roots; twisted and sour-smelling often, honored very seldom, they are in His mind the life of the world.

My attitude to these people is the truest index of my own humanity; before Christ it will one day be my judgment.

WHO ARE THE POOR?

The poor are not only the impoverished and those in need of food and shelter. The poor is everyone who cannot actually save from the weekly wage something to set against the inevitable day of sickness and old age. The poor is the majority of us.

"Inasmuch as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me." This is the mandate every Christian has from our Lord: to do to his brother man as he would have men do to him. It takes a lot

* 226 Lafayette St., New York 12, N. Y., Feb. 23, 1949

of faith to take Christ at His word. Efficiency in good works is not faith.

There is much eloquence about the social apostolate of the Church in these days. The social encyclicals are printed by the millions and sometimes read. Men seldom have been saved by rhetoric or printing. As in the days of Christ men need to see the Truth.

It was what men saw Christ doing and the Apostles doing and good men doing in every age that moved men to make fellowship with them.

Each of us who believes in Him must pour his own life into His words, that men may see what the pamphlets and the pulpits and the Catholic press are talking about.



False Liberal

"Adam was the first liberal. He would have unrestricted personal liberty regardless of the consequences. Yes, I know it is not popular to speak of the Father of mankind. You get into theology. That's God's world and the modern generation wants none of it. We do speak of Adam, nonetheless. If you believe in God, you must accept Adam. He is the key to the present condition of the world. He was the world's first rugged individualist. He was the first to abuse that mighty, mysterious gift—the terrible power of liberty, the freedom even to deny or to defy God Himself.

"Every Godless so-called liberal ever since has been guilty of the same error. Freedom, the liberty to do as you please, is the only virtue in the Godless liberal's book. Order, authority, spiritual obligations have no meaning for him. He is a sovereign, a supreme being in his own right."—*Rev. William J. Smith, S.J., in an address to the Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn Council No. 60, April 10, 1949.*

Science, Materialism and the Human Spirit

JACQUES MARITAIN

Professor of Philosophy, Princeton University

Address at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Convocation panel,
April 1, 1949.

IT IS a fact that the Western World's consciousness is deeply troubled and divided. Obviously there is a problem. The crisis is first intellectual; its main symptom in this regard is not so much dogmatic materialism as that kind of abdication of reason which makes man unable to believe in anything but facts and figures and sense-data. And the crisis is also moral—hence an incapacity for “continued common action at the highest levels of the human spirit.”

I would say, as a preliminary remark, that the problem we are facing, and which deals with the role of science and technology, is twofold. It has to be examined in two different perspectives.

The first perspective is the perspective of the intrinsic truth of the matter. Here we are concerned with a *philosophical* issue.

The second perspective is the perspective of the historical state of our civilization, and of our human possibilities for recovery. Let us say that the issue we are facing then is a *social* issue.

The two issues just mentioned should not be confused. It might be possible, after all, that men become one day intellectually and morally bewildered beyond repair. Such a negative solution to the *social* issue

would by no means change the realities that the *philosophical* issue has to take into account. What is true would remain true, what is false would remain false, even if the majority of men became unable to grasp it.

The philosophical issue is both speculative and moral. *In the speculative field:*

1. There are two typically different noetic approaches to reality: the *empiriological* and the *ontological* approach. The empiriological approach tends somehow to the epistemological ideal described by Logical Positivism. Concepts and definitions are resolved in the observable and measurable as such, that is, in the last analysis, in sense data (sense readings of measuring instruments) upon which a system of signs and symbols, especially mathematical entities, is to be built. The explanatory value of that system depends on the verification of its conclusions by experience. Any judgment has meaning only to the extent that it refers to sense observation and expresses the experimental ways through which it can be verified.

On the contrary, in the ontological approach, concepts and definitions are resolved in being, and express intelligible objects that abstractive

visualization brings out from experience. The truth of the assertions thus established rests in the last analysis on basic intellectual intuitions, especially the first self-evident principles.

SCIENCE AND BEING

2. The empiriological approach is peculiar to science. Scientific theories deal with the observable and measurable as such, not with being itself.

The ontological approach is peculiar to philosophy and metaphysics. They deal with being and the intelligible structure of things, not with the mathematical or experimental explanation of phenomena.

Through quite other ways, religious faith also looks at things in an ontological (or even supra-ontological) perspective.

Because science is at work on a specifically different plane of knowledge, science, while progressing *ad infinitum* in the knowledge of things, will never propose any answer or pose any question dealing with the specific object with which ontological knowledge is concerned.

3. Science and technology, considered in their very natures, are by no means responsible for the intellectual crisis of our time. They accomplish in their own sphere their specific task, which not only practically and as to the mastery over nature, but also speculatively and as to the knowledge of truth, gives testimony to the greatness of the human spirit. Neither does that task impair the workings of the human spirit in its other domains, nor entail by itself any kind of materialism.

4. What is responsible for the crisis is the impact of the prodigious development of science in modern times on human reason's myth-making suggestibility and natural lust for facility. Common consciousness was to expect from science the solution to every problem, and to mistake the progress of science for the advent of a new metaphysics and religion. First of all, philosophers were either to construct pseudo-metaphysics that were but spurious extrapolations of science, or to betray philosophy in repudiating metaphysics, assuming that what has no meaning for the scientist has no meaning at all, and making reason a mere operator of sensory devices.

5. Science itself provides a remedy. First, because it preserves and treasures, on its own level, the sense of truth and of rational objectivity. Second, because—despite the deontologized character of science *made—science in the making*, I mean the pioneering scientist, the great discoverer, the man of vision, who renews scientific concepts, is quickened by a power of poetic insight and a thirst for being that science itself cannot satisfy, and which incite him toward questions that are beyond the scope of science: determinism and freedom, matter and spirit, the origin and destiny of the universe, the existence of God.

In this connection we must pay great and respectful attention to the experience of many contemporary scientists who have been led by their meditation upon science either into the philosophical or the religious

realm. Yet one cannot properly answer philosophical questions without genuine philosophical equipment. The next step for such scientists is to become themselves philosophers, and to recognize the autonomous sphere of philosophical truth.

6. Thus a serious possibility exists that a reconciliation of science and wisdom may be achieved in a number of minds. But as to our civilization as a whole this would require in our contemporaries a vigor and range of intellect the probability of which seems to be questionable.

THE MORAL FIELD

7. Science and technology provide us with means. The determination of the human ends for which those means are to be used presupposes knowledge of *what is man* and *what is the meaning of human life*, and this is not the job of science and technology, but of metaphysics, ethics, and religion.

8. Science and technology, considered in their very natures, are not responsible for the moral crisis of our time, nor for the destructive or besotting and dehumanizing use we are making of the means that they put in our hands, nor for the civilization, technocratic in type, which worshippers of technology wish to prepare for us.

9. What is responsible for the crisis is greed and will to power, and the temptation to which a kind of omnipotence encouraged by science and technology gives rise in the human race, which has not yet succeeded in submitting to reason the behavior

of man, especially collective man. Thus the human person is threatened today with all-pervading slavery, not through the fault of science, but through that of the enlarged power granted by science and technology (that is, by reason mastering natural phenomena) to human foolishness.

10. The moral problem thus faced by the scientist, his sense of responsibility toward the human community, his realization of the fact that mankind equipped with technology cannot survive without ethical wisdom, are making for him the rediscovery of the true ends and supreme standards of human life a matter of emergency. Such a rediscovery cannot be brought about by science itself, but by ethical awareness and ethical philosophy, and religious faith. So a trend is developing within the scientific world toward a wisdom and a spiritual unification of man that are beyond the scope of merely scientific work.

11. Where it is a question of moral recovery, not only reason but all the highest spiritual activities in man must be called to work. As Bergson put it, the world's body, now larger, calls for a surplus of soul, so that the mechanical and the mystical summon one another. In other terms, technology can really perform its task of human liberation only if the sense of inner freedom and contemplative love is made by the Gospel's inspiration to play a leading part in the new industrial civilization.

Coming now to what I have called the *social issue*:

12. Since science's competence ex-

tends to observable and measurable phenomena, not to the inner being of things, and to the means, not to the ends of human life, it would be nonsense to expect that the progress of science will provide men with a new type of metaphysics, ethics or religion. The development of the scientific spirit, and the progress of science and technology, improve in an invaluable manner the inner, intellectual and moral, as well as the external and material, equipment of human life. Yet it is up to ontological knowledge, not to science, to judge of the values, norms and ends which make human life simply good or bad.

HOPE IN THE GOSPEL

13. However important and indispensable the action of ideas, of philosophical understanding and religious enlightenment may be for the destiny and possible recovery of the world, the issue, as soon as it is a question of the collective life of men and of the attitude of mass consciousness, shifts for a considerable part from the realm of truth to be known to the realm of historical and social achievements to be attained. Thus, by a kind of pseudomorphosis, problems which in themselves are philosophical or spiritual become posed in or transposed into social terms. If man were to lose terrestrial hope in the Gospel, I am afraid our hope in

a spiritual recovery of civilization would be doomed to disappointment.

14. Will the progressive transformation of society that we are facing today be able to manifest the power of freedom and justice and of spiritual energies by securing both the technological structure of our emergent civilization and its supra-technological guiding inspiration, the organization of the world and the individual liberty as well as the autonomy of groups starting from the bottom, the accession of new classes to ownership and power and the freedoms claimed by science and intelligence in quest of truth, as well as by the word of God in quest of human hearts?

15. If the efforts made toward such an historical ideal are to succeed, a general recovery can be expected, extending to the highest functions of the human spirit. If those efforts are to be a failure, a general worsening in our spiritual condition is to be expected—whoever the winners in the political game may be—with a general domination of materialism and a general enslavement of the human person. The truth and the high requirements of art and poetry, science and philosophy, religion and spirituality, would continue to be served but in the catacombs of human history, and under the conditions of a suffering diaspora.

The Recovery of France

FRANK MACMILLAN

*Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX**

AS THESE lines are written (February) there has occurred the most encouraging phenomenon in the French economy since the Liberation. The franc, which had spiralled dizzily downwards from an official tied rate of 480 to the pound in 1945-46, to 1,055 last winter, and which was never really worth even that, suddenly and unexpectedly began to appreciate at a sensational rate. On successive days the quotation of the pound on the "parallel" market dropped from 1,400 to 1,350, and then to 1,280. The appreciation went as far as 1,180 and though it receded a little it gives every indication of being maintained at 1,200. At the same time the prices of foodstuffs in some of the provincial markets began to come down with startling rapidity.

It is still too early to foretell whether this inaugurates a long-delayed return to normal trading and the end of the black market on the one hand, and the realization of a stabilization of currency on the other. The causes are equally complex and, at the moment, undefined. It seems likely that the success of the first meetings of the Organization for European Economic Co-operation may have encouraged a return of capital from abroad: and that, coinciding with the encouraging success of the Government's loan, may have

given investors confidence that their investments will not be allowed to depreciate in the fashion which has ruined the savings of thousands of small pensioners in the last five years. That, as M. Reynaud has pointed out incessantly, is the root of the question of confidence in the currency; and he had advocated just some such procedure as the Treasury has just adopted in floating the new loan—permitting the transfer of old Government stocks at the equivalent of their real money value at the time they were bought, and guaranteeing that similar allowances will be made in the future to investors realizing their holdings of the new stock. Certainly, the Queuille Government has the chance to create and benefit by a return of confidence, which was vainly sought by the Blum experiment of 1947 and the projected Reynaud program of July-August, 1948.

But the problems and difficulties confronting the Government are still enormous; and they constitute an intricate network of economic and political factors of which it is possible to isolate the various threads, but impossible—as successive Ministers of Finance have discovered to their cost—to say which will prove of greater importance from month to month and crisis to crisis.

For example, one of the chief diffi-

* St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Eire, April, 1949

culties of the Government will be to make the cheap prices of food-stuffs in the country available to the housewives in the cities. The farmers complain that the rise in prices between country and city is due to the activity of the enormous number of middlemen. But the city dealers contend that most of the increase is due to the high costs of transport. The railways are nationalized; so the Government should be able to act at once in reducing the price of transport. But the railways also blame their costs on the high prices of coal and electricity—which, too, are nationalized. As the railways lost 28 milliards of francs last year, the mines 20 milliards and the *Electricité de France* 6 milliards, the whole field of the nationalizations comes under review; and at the moment the Government is pledged to a program of rationalizing the administration of these industries to make them self-supporting.

The problem of high food costs, dropping currency value and industrial discontent has formed a baffling pattern for foreign observers (and French commentators) for the past few years; because it has marched steadily with really gigantic efforts towards reconstruction in the heavy industries, whose plant had been almost worn-out during the Occupation, reconstruction of the transport system, which had been smashed by Allied bombings and German demolitions during the war, and an impressive re-building program.

When one traveled about in the

provinces it was difficult to believe that one was in a country suffering from a prolonged economic crisis; food was plentiful, especially meat, to an extent that made British visitors wistful as they thought of the rations at home; butter and eggs were available in quantities superior to anything across the Channel; bread, admittedly, was poor in quality, sugar was scarce and milk almost unobtainable in the cities. But the farmers and country-folk were living better than ever before, the minefields were cleared by a vast employment of prisoner labor, the 1946 harvest was very good, and the live-stock wealth of the country was rapidly coming up to peace-time level. If the industrial figures, which indicated that production was better than before the war, were vitiated to some extent (as M. Reynaud keeps insisting) by the Government's acceptance of 1938 as a basis of comparison (though it had witnessed a double mobilization and this had adversely affected production), they were nonetheless an impressive tribute to the really hard work being done in all branches of industry.

CRISIS WITHOUT REASON

But prices continued to rise, the franc continued to depreciate, strikes broke out and Governments fell every six months. It seemed to be a crisis without valid reason and with no prospect of cure.

In the view of this observer, that crisis was primarily political. After the Liberation of Paris there was

enacted an unofficial *épuration*—a polite euphemism sanctioned by successive Governments to describe a wide-spread campaign of murder, terror and spoliation—which has left its ravages till the present day but which, up till recently, it has not been possible to survey on anything like a rational basis. Those of us who participated in the Normandy campaign of 1944 recall the mingled feelings with which we saw the "Resistance" units which sprang up in liberated territory. A few of these were excellently disciplined; and there were many individuals who performed valuable services in small-scale local actions and in supplementing and confirming the intelligence which was available to the Allied Armies from other sources, such as aerial reconnaissance, wireless interception and so on. And many of these *résistants* earned our respect and gratitude for their daring and self-sacrifice, which often went as far as laying down their lives in the moment of victory. But with that there were features which marred the story of the Resistance—public victimizations of collaborationists, particularly women, which revolted the ordinary British soldier. And that was in territory where the Allied services could and did exercise a considerable restraining influence.

But in areas where the Allies were merely passing through to the battles in the North of France, the Government of de Gaulle had little real authority during 1944; and there took place in these regions a veri-

table reign of terror which was predominantly operated by the Communist irregular forces. It was computed by the chief of the historical services on General Eisenhower's staff that there were 500,000 victims, during 1944, in the Mediterranean area alone.

DE GAULLE'S GOVERNMENT

De Gaulle managed to extend the authority of his Administration and exercise some discipline over the Communist bands after his journey to Moscow, in November, 1944, which secured for his Government the recognition of the Kremlin. But the price of recognition was the re-admission to France of the Communist leaders, particularly Thorez, who had been condemned to death as a deserter and a traitor in 1939 by the Daladier Government for his action in deserting the colors and broadcasting anti-Allied propaganda on the Moscow radio from 1939 till June 22, 1941. It is possible to criticize many of de Gaulle's actions as Chief of the Provisional Government but it is not easy to condemn him for attempting to restore some kind of order in 1944-45, even at the price of Thorez.

But illegal purges were followed during 1945 and 1946 by a hideous campaign of legalized *épuration*, which was even more sinister in that it utilized the legal traditions of the French Courts for blatantly partisan political ends. Independent commentators like François Mauriac bitterly denounced these travesties of

justice; but all the Parties were equally guilty in accepting the Communist thesis that the dead of the Resistance called for the indiscriminate liquidation, degradation and spoliation of anyone who could be labeled *vichyssois* or *collaborateur*.

COMMUNIST STRENGTH

The result of this campaign of blackmail and purges was that no one dared speak against the Communists for fear of his very life. That fear lasted until the first elections to the Constituent Assembly in 1946 (after the departure of de Gaulle) revealed the Communists as the largest party in the country. But the emergence of the MRP, which before the war had not been much more numerous than, say, the Scottish or Welsh Nationalist parties in Britain, came as a shock and surprise to all French and foreign observers. Nonetheless, the Communist strength was so great that most people felt they were almost bound to win absolute power in the next year, supported as they were by the richest propaganda organization and a free use of bribery and patronage by reason of their grip on all the Ministries in charge of industrial production.

It was only when successive elections showed that the Communists had reached, but could not increase, a total of some 5 million votes in the country that people began to breathe a little more freely. The MRP had polled around 5 million votes in each of these elections, and the Socialists about 3 million. These, with the

much-eclipsed Radicals, were sufficient to ensure that the Communists would never obtain an absolute majority, nor the key Ministries which they so desired in the typical manner of the Communist Parties of Eastern Europe—the Ministries of War and of the Interior.

The situation was further eased by the expulsion of the Communists from the Government by the Socialist Administration of M. Ramadier in the Spring of 1947. This was followed by the formation of the Gaullist Rally (RPF). But the tension was maintained by the constitution of the Cominform; and France, with Italy, prepared itself for a Communist offensive against the Marshall Plan in the industrial field. The expected strikes came and were broken, in 1947 and 1948, by the Socialist Minister of the Interior, M. Jules Moch; and the French public perceived that the threat, though grave, was not immediately deadly.

But this long political struggle, with the Communists able at will to exploit the real economic hardships of the workers for political ends, made it impossible for the Ramadier, Schuman and Queuille Governments to stabilize the currency or encourage confidence among investors. And the political battle had to be won before the most serious source of inflation could be tackled—the conduct of the nationalized industries.

Ever since de Gaulle had attained undisputed political leadership of the Provisional Government in Algiers, following on the unlooked-for re-

removal of Darlan and the more conventional elimination of Giraud, he had tended to interest himself in the military and political issues of Government and had accepted fairly uncritically the Constitutional projects whose main author was M. Vincent Auriol. These projects had envisaged an industrial policy which involved a considerable scheme of nationalization of industry. There might have been an arguable case for adopting such an economic program in an orderly and gradual fashion over a period of years after the end of hostilities. But, as the projects of nationalization were finally conceived and voted, they embodied features which were inevitably to hamper the recovery of the country and the currency.

DEFECTS OF NATIONALIZATION

In the first place they were conceived in an unashamedly partisan spirit and linked up with the campaign of *épuration* in the Courts. The preambles to the various Bills mentioned among the reasons for the nationalizations the fact, or allegation, that the previous owners and managements had "collaborated" with the enemy. It was a wide and spacious term; and the owners could very reasonably have claimed that by their policy they had kept the fabric of the industries in something like working order for the new regime; and that they had saved thousands of French workers from being deported to forced labor in Germany.

The second defect of the nation-

alizations was that the management of the industries was placed under Communist Ministers, mainly because the Communists had carried out a purge of the CGT (*Confédération Générale du Travail*) and it was thought that under Communist Ministers there would be less possibility of industrial unrest: and in a period when all the emphasis was on production and reconstruction, peace in industry was a foremost consideration.

Thus it was that the mines, railways, electricity undertakings and aviation industries, among others, passed under Communist control at every stage from the Cabinet downwards. At a time when all the Parties were "colonizing" the Ministries—finding places for their supporters and consolidating their hold on the sources of information and power—the Communists carried out a model campaign. The economic results of their industrial purges have been becoming visible in the past two years.

It may be doubted whether any country could have found sufficient reserves of civil servants and industrial administrators to ensure that France's nationalization program would have been efficient, even if it had been spread over several years. But when it is reflected that the great Northern mine-fields were nationalized between December 1944 and May 1946; the aviation and automobile plants in 1945; the Bank of France, the Insurance Companies and the *Electricité de France* in 1946; it is clear that the theorists were more concerned to mingle the

omelette so that the eggs could never be reconstituted than to save the Treasury from crippling losses (which of course were passed on to the tax-payers).

The laws covering the nationalizations also included great sums which were to be devoted to the welfare of personnel, *cités ouvrières* and so on. But various reports from official and independent sources (some of them foreign) suggest that considerable sections of the workers took a light view of their responsibilities in return for this sympathetic legislation. Apart from misuse of plant for private gain (as in the *Electricité de France*) at the lowest levels, there was considerable evidence of lack of will to output in various industries (notably in the mines); and when to these was added a slackening of discipline by the appointment of political *protégés* at all echelons of the administration (the aviation industry provided some of the most flagrant examples), the disastrous balance-sheets were inevitable.

Since the departure of the Communists from the Government in 1947, the successive Administrations of Ramadier, Robert Schuman and Queuille have endeavored to prepare public opinion for some retrenchment in public spending. During M. André Marie's short-lived Administration of July-August, 1948, M. Paul Reynaud, who has been forthright in his denunciation of the rake's progress of France since 1944, endeavored to bludgeon the Parties into an acceptance of really massive

economies; but with the Socialists more and more nervous at the prospect of going to the country in October at the elections to the County Councils and facing the Gaullist and Communist attacks, the scheme (and the Government) was defeated. But the publication of the Treasury accounts for the nationalized industries for 1945-47; the account of the *Cour des Comptes* on public spending in all departments during 1947-48; the estimated losses due to the strikes of November and December, 1947 and 1948 have raised such dismay among tax-payers and the Press that some economies may be undertaken this year.

ECONOMIC FACTIONS

The result of these political and economic factors has been to split the country into various economic factions each fighting for its own hand and each with some means of exercising pressure on the Government. As the volume of taxation has risen (mostly indirectly—in food, transport, heating and rents), the fixed-income earners have suffered more than any other section of the community. The lower-paid civil servants, teachers and so on have had to call on their savings; while old people and pensioners have seen their reserves devalued till the credit of State loans has been almost irreparably damaged.

The organized workers, whether in the Communist *Confédération Générale du Travail*, the Socialist break-away union *Force Ouvrière*,

or the Catholic *Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens*, can generally exert pressure on the three main Governmental Parties, the more so because their economic situations enable them to act together—as in strikes—however different may be their motives and ideologies. The peasants and farmers also are able to stake their claims either through the Communist Agricultural Union or by the more traditional methods of immediate contact with public representatives at all levels. But they have also the opportunity of selling to the black market or of withholding their produce from the markets to maintain prices. (It was such a manoeuvre to keep up meat prices which led to the fall of the Marie-Reynaud team last August.)

OTHER GROUPS

Then there is the vast army of the black marketeers and war profiteers who are incessantly denounced by all the Parties without any of them so far having been brought to justice. (When the Communist and Gaullist press recently published a case of economic collaboration which, they alleged, was being hushed up, the Minister of Justice, M. Marie, had to resign and the Press published comparative statistics of the nature of the cases of "collaboration" which had been tried by the Courts. Diplomats, soldiers, civil servants and journalists were the chief victims; but there have been no cases of prosecution for "economic collaboration." The moral was drawn that it was more profit-

able—and safer—to have helped build the Atlantic Wall than to have written articles describing it.)

The last class—also silent, though in this case perforce—are the victims of the *épuration* scandals, who have been despoiled, degraded and declared ineligible to vote, or be elected to public office. The Radicals and former Conservatives have been the chief sufferers from this campaign of vindictiveness which has been repeatedly denounced by the French Hierarchy. These men and their families—numbering tens of thousands—have been well-nigh placed outside the national community on the charge—made glibly, and from partisanship, by the Communists; and accepted from motives of cowardice and self-interest by the MRP and the Socialists—that they obeyed the orders of the Petain Government. But it is abundantly clear, from recent defences of their juridical position, that no such charge can possibly lie in French law: because the Petain Government was the only repository of legal authority and was so recognized by international opinion. Russia raised the status of its representative to Vichy to that of an Ambassador (before 1941); America recognized that Government by its Ambassador till 1941—a recognition which it did not extend to de Gaulle till after the war; all the neutrals recognized the legality of Petain—the Holy See, Switzerland, Eire and the rest. No charge can therefore lie against private citizens or civil servants who obeyed it, whatever

may be the position of the politicians and Ministers of that Government.

The results of this great schism in the body politic of France are far-reaching and profound. As the Communists continue to fight relentlessly for the policy of Russia, no matter what the economic cost to France, more and more people turn to de Gaulle as the most steadily anti-Communist leader. As his Party, the RPF, is still not in a position to influence the course of events directly, the MRP finds itself hampered in its dealings with its partners in the Coalition. It has been embarrassed also by the activities of the *chrétiens progressistes*, who take the Communist line at all times, despite the recent warning by Cardinal Suhard, which followed the same lines as the condemnation by the Papacy of the similar movement in Italy.

NATION DIVIDED

At the same time, those Catholics who are inclined to view de Gaulle's movement with suspicion, as a possible hide-out for reactionaries and ex-Pétainists, find that the Socialists are turning more and more to the Radicals as the most likely advocates of a Third Force program; and the common ground is likely to be a rally round the principles of old-fashioned anti-clericalism. The maintenance of the ban on Pétainists—who are the most bitter enemies of de Gaulle because of his lack of interest in the *épuration*—is making for a permanent division of the nation. And the sacrifice of the middle-classes to the

interests of the organized blocs of industrial workers is striking a blow at the foundation of State credit—the incentive to save. From this point of view the establishment in 1947 of a Congress of the Middle Classes by the newspaper *Figaro*—again paralleled by a similar organization in Italy—is one of the most significant features of the economic life of free societies under the stress of planned economies.

Just as the factors underlying the contemporary crisis of France are complex and inter-related, so the remedies are varied and, in their individual aspects, partial. The solution to the Communist problem—what Leon Blum described in his book, *A l'Echelle Humaine*, as “a foreign nationalist party” within the State—is obviously one which is not confined to France. Some beginning was made in isolating the Party when its Ministers were dismissed from the Government; and as the various international plans near completion and their economic effect begins to be felt, there may be some diminution of this threat. Again the possibility of military guarantees may induce investors to bring back their reserves of capital from foreign countries or private hoards. This latter factor involves also the caches of money stored away by those citizens who have been “degraded” or are threatened by the *épuration*.

Since the fall of M. Marie, after the Sainrapt-Brice affair of economic collaboration, there has been a more determined bid to end this

scandalous injustice by amnesty. That would have the incidental effect of re-admitting to public life, at every level, large numbers of experienced and patriotic administrators. And any moves which would lead to a reform in the administration and system of accountancy in the nationalized industries would alleviate the burden of taxation. De Gaulle, who has reorganized the economic section of his Rally, has been advocating a system of "association" of workers and owners in industry; and it will be interesting to see if the Parties move into line in this matter, as they have quietly moved into line with the Gaullist thesis on most international questions. The status of de Gaulle and his large national following has been of considerable assistance to the French Foreign Office, particularly in its dealings with Mr. Bevin, Mr. Dalton and Mr. Attlee, who have a morbid suspicion of the General. Thus when de Gaulle had voiced French opinion (as he undoubtedly did) on such questions as the statute of the Ruhr, it was helpful to French diplomats to be able to present their foreign colleagues with the alternative of accommodating French views, rather than help de Gaulle's propaganda by compelling the Quai d'Orsay to accept solutions because of the economic and military weakness of France.

But there is one underlying problem which has been reiterated only by Mr. Paul Reynaud, which must

be solved if France is to become anything like the Power she has heretofore been in the world. That is the question of output per man-hour. It is to some extent the problem of Britain also. French official statisticians are fond of quoting the recovery figures of France against those of 1938; and that, as has already been shown, is an insufficient index in the post-war world. But even if the index of comparison were 1930—before the slump—the comparison would still be unrealistic.

The true comparison, for France and Britain, must be, as M. Reynaud and M. Raymond Aron insist, the improved productivity of the nation as compared with the ratio in the United States. As the peoples of the West more and more base their demands for a standard of living comparable with the richest of the nations of the modern world, they must more and more meet the comparison of productivity. And that challenge will not be met (again quoting M. Reynaud) while France is working on the five-day week and also trying to support costly schemes of social legislation, together with an armaments program commensurate with her needs as the most exposed of the great Powers. Harder work would only be one step towards the solution, as Mr. Aron has pointed out in his recent analysis *Le Grand Schisme*. France will also have to look critically at her production methods in every field of national economy.

How to Fight Communists

BY THE EDITORS

Reprinted through the courtesy of TIME*

Copyright Time, Inc., 1949

IN 6,000 Italian towns and villages last week workers attended "feasts of liberty." Fireworks and oratory popped triumphantly. Two thousand anti-Communist soapboxers, doorbell ringers and pamphlet carriers crowded into Rome's shiny, modern Cinema Metropolitan, hoarsely chanting the name of Luigi Gedda. Finally, a brawny, firm-jawed man rose from his seat in the first row and brusquely acknowledged the cheers. He was the chief strategist of Italy's Catholic Action movement; he had just led his followers to a notable victory.

PLAN S

Last winter, Luigi Gedda called on Catholic Action's *comitati civici* (citizens' committees) for a major effort. He named it Plan S (for syndicalism). He wanted to build up the Free Federation of Italian Labor, to rival the Red-run Italian Confederation of Labor (C.G.I.L.) through which the Communists have kept an iron grip on four million of Italy's workers. Gedda's goal was to enlist two million members for the Free Federation.

Last week's reports from half of Gedda's provincial headquarters showed more than a million enrolled.

When all the returns are in, Gedda is confident that the two million goal will be exceeded. His fingertips casually joined, his eyes on the ceiling, Gedda last week sat behind his cluttered mahogany desk and reviewed the campaign. "It went as we planned," he said calmly. "There was a lot of hard work . . ."

Catholic Action reaches into every town, every slum, every factory and every village. Its agents are a strangely assorted phalanx—school-teachers and school-children, lawyers and factory workers, nuns and union leaders. At Catholic Action headquarters, pink-cheeked girl secretaries race through the long, white-washed corridors, barely dodging pale, serious priests. They all take their orders from Catholic Action executives.

When the Communists set up low-cost lunch counters in factories, Catholic Action did the same—and tried to serve better food. When Communist women's organizations sent poor children to the country, Catholic Action went to work until its own kids-to-the-country program by far outdid the Reds'. Last year Catholic Action helped send over a million needy youngsters to summer camps.

When Communists organize rallies,

* 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., March 28, 1949

Catholic Action organizes bigger ones. At a recent demonstration in Rome, Catholic Action provided the loudspeakers, the spectators' platforms, the slogans, the music, the buses, boats and trains that carried out-of-towners to the city. It even organized the housewives to pack box lunches and send their husbands to the meeting. It was typical of Catholic Action's zealous exuberance that brown-robed Franciscan monks climbed on lamp posts and snapped pictures of the rally. Catholic Action speakers frequently engage Communist leaders in public debates. One of the most tireless debaters is a Dominican, Father Felix Morlion, who challenged Red Boss Palmiro Togliatti to a debate over Cardinal Mindszenty's trial. Togliatti sent a substitute, Communist Senator Ottavio Pastore. When Pastore was through, Father Morlion quietly mounted the rostrum beneath a huge portrait of Togliatti and smilingly proceeded to answer the Senator's ranting. "To conquer misery," Father Morlion concluded, "it is not necessary to suppress religion."

Catholic Action wives are encouraged to work on recalcitrant husbands. In Valle Aurelia (one of Rome's Reddest districts), a worker explained his recent break with Communism. When his wife came home from church on Sundays she repeated the priest's sermons; his children played on the Catholic Action playground; and finally, Catholic welfare workers took his sick mother-in-law to a hospital and paid her expenses.

At that point he tore up his party card.

HOW PEOPLE LIVE

A typical example of how Catholic Action organizes the workers is provided by drab Prima Valle, a working class quarter built by Mussolini. It had been a neat village of tree-shaded squares and cheerful flowerbeds. Neglect and overcrowding during the war had ruined it. Now cold winds blow through the gaping windows. The trees have been cut down for firewood and the flowerbeds are grey dust. "We live," an old man said, "in a very expensive graveyard."

The Catholic Action *comitati* for Prima Valle is headed by Galeazzo Galletti, a pale, bespectacled clerk. He has 13 district commanders, each of whom controls a dozen *capo-scala* ("stair-leaders"). The Communists poked fun at "Father Galletti and his 13 apostles." The Catholic Actionists rounded up 1,500 likely prospects, began bombarding them with pamphlets. In the 1946 elections, Prima Valle had voted six-to-one for Communism. Last year, less than half of Prima Valle's vote was Red. Says Galletti: "We learned that we could make better propaganda than the Communists."

Propaganda alone would not have been enough to divert the leftward drift of Italian workers, who want higher pay and better hours. Catholic Action had to demonstrate that it could operate as effectively as the Reds in reaching those goals. One

of Galletti's lieutenants, quiet, earnest Luigi Giacomini, recently faced that problem head-on. He went straight to the manager of the machine shop in which he works and on behalf of his comrades asked for overtime pay and elimination of Sunday work. The manager brusquely declined. Galletti advised: "Invite the man to Prima Valle and let him see how people live."

A few nights later the manager strode into a meeting of a Prima Valle citizens' committee. Galletti told the manager: "You want us to convince the workers that they should not follow Communist orders. How can we do that unless you do your share and give them their due?" A few days later, the manager met the workers' demands. A fourth of the

workers in his plant promptly joined the free labor organization.

Luigi Gedda was not resting on Catholic Action's laurels. He said that the citizens' committees would continue their drive for the Free Federation. He wants to keep the committees in fighting trim for his spring campaign which he has already planned. It is called Plan D (for *disoccupazione*) and will fight unemployment.

Gedda was still far from having won the battle against the Italian Communists. His Catholic Action, however, had demonstrated the most effective way of fighting Communists: to match their faith with firmer faith, their discipline with greater discipline, and their hard work with harder work.



Quarantine the Aggressor

"How are we to fight communism, how are we to contain its spread, how are we to arrest its corrupting influence upon our youth, upon our racial minorities, upon some of our people who like to proclaim from the housetops that they are true-blue liberals?

"For myself I am content to lift a page from a great master, from the speech made by President Roosevelt in Chicago in 1937 in which he suggested that the free world quarantine the Nazi aggressors. Today the free world must quarantine the Communist aggressors.

"To maintain our health and freedom we must put communism in quarantine. And that means more than just placing geographic limits on the expansion of Russia's empire. We must deny the Communists in our midst the cloak of respectability and the stamp of approval."—*David Dubinsky, President of the International Ladies Garment Workers, at a dinner in New York, April 23, 1949.*

Leadership in a Democracy

Reprinted from CIP*

MR. R. G. MENZIES, Opposition leader of the Australian Parliament and former Prime Minister, writing in the *New York Times Magazine*, Nov. 28, 1948, urges the democracies to turn their attention to the problem of leadership. He considers it a cause of concern that "our legislative assemblies are a fair popular cross section, not a *corps d'élite*." Although much of his article is a call for a fuller participation of all the people in politics, it would thus appear, at least implicitly, that he advocates the training of an élite to solve the problem of leadership in a democracy.

Such a plea is of course not a new one. The main question is whether or not it is consonant with democratic ends and means.

I. *Leadership in a democracy presents a particularly difficult problem because of public indifference to politics and the hazards inherent in popular election.*

Mr. Menzies expresses particular concern "at the indifference to politics shown by so many thousands of active, intelligent and well-informed men and women." The Presidential election provides a good measure of the extent of that indifference in the United States. Out of an estimated 95 million people eligible to vote, only about half of that number actually voted this year. With the total

population estimated at somewhere around 140 million, this means that there is only one vote to each three persons, with one-third consisting of minors and others not qualified to vote, one-third qualified but who did not bother to vote, and the one-third who actually went to the polls.

Such indifference on the part of the voters obviously has an effect upon the problem of leadership. It offers ground for the frequent observation that the people have no reason to complain of the quality and stature of their representatives when they fail to take part in the task of selecting them.

Even granting this, it still remains true, however, that the people and their lack of participation are not entirely to blame. The quality of leadership will depend equally on the kind of men that are presented for the people's choice. Mr. Menzies laments that "most men of ability prefer the objective work of science, the law, literature, scholarship or the immediately stimulating and profitable work of manufacturing, commerce or finance" to a career in politics. He notes in particular that in politics "we discourage young men of parts by confronting them with poor material rewards, precariousness of tenure, an open public cynicism about their motives and cheap sneers about their real or supposed search for pub-

licity." Indeed, the demands of popular election are such as to discourage if not actually to defeat many well and even exceptionally qualified men from running for public office.

As a result of these two factors—public indifference and the difficulties of popular election—the legislative assemblies of a democracy tend to be, as Mr. Menzies declares, "a fair popular cross section, not a *corps d'élite*."

II. *Leadership in a democracy, particularly in the legislative branch, is better equipped to carry out its task if it is a representative cross section than if it consists of a special élite.*

It is seriously questionable whether a "*corps d'élite*" such as Mr. Menzies seems to recommend would be desirable even if there were a practicable means of achieving it democratically. Of course, the lawmakers of a democracy, as of any state, should have available the most skilled and competent opinion and advice they can obtain. Especially now that the problems confronting government have become so universal and difficult there can be no question that experts are needed. The question, however, is whether the legislatures of a democracy should themselves be experts—an élite specially trained to deal with the problems of government.

In the actual practice of most democracies there tends to be a rather sharp distinction drawn between the expert and the legislator or representative. The Congress of the United States, for example, makes no pretense of being a body of experts. As representative of the American peo-

ple, it prides itself on being a more or less representative cross section of American life. This does not mean, however, that Congress does not have the advice of experts in drawing up legislation. The Congress has its own research staffs. Any piece of major legislation recommended by the Executive branch is first drawn up with the advice and knowledge of the career men in the various departments, specially trained in their own field. Furthermore, the Congressional Committee hearings on any piece of legislation enlist the opinions and advice of leaders in private life, who in their own way may be considered as experts or a special élite. Congress reserves itself for a different role.

GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT

One of the major functions of the representative body in making law might be said to be that of testing its applicability to the people as a whole. This is not a minor function in law-making. As is pointed out by legal philosophers, one of the conditions of good law is that it be applicable to the people; this condition is, in fact, another aspect of the doctrine of government by consent. In the exercise of such a function Congress would seem to be better equipped if it is a cross-section of the population than if it consisted of a special élite or a body of experts. As a cross section, Congress immediately affords a testing-ground for any proposed law. It is the nation in miniature, and if the expert can succeed in persuading the Congress of the wisdom and practicality of his proposal, it should stand a

fair chance of being accepted by the people as a whole.

Such a procedure is obviously harder and slower than if the expert had only to persuade a body of experts, and it certainly frequently happens that many carefully thought-out and skillfully constructed plans have failed because they could not obtain the approval of a few Congressmen. But it is important to remember that the law is not being made for experts or an élite. It is being made for the whole people. In view of this fact, Congress would seem the better equipped to carry out its function the closer it is to the people, to their needs and to what they will accept and apply.

Under this view of the representative function, the expert or the élite body stands at a distinct disadvantage precisely as representing a specialty. What is needed here is the general view of the whole people and their needs and desires such as "a fair popular cross-section" can provide.

DISTRUST OF ELITES

III. *Leadership in American democracy has traditionally found its solution in the ideal of raising the standard of the whole people rather than in the formation of a special élite.*

Democratic practice has been buttressed, especially in America, by a traditional distrust of élites. It cannot be denied that this has frequently had bad effects, particularly when, as Mr. Menzies points out, it makes special training and qualifications a handicap before the electorate. Yet at

bottom the distrust of special élites in politics would seem to rest on a sound basis. It is a recognition that élites almost inevitably involve distrust of the people.

This characteristic of élites is well borne out in their contemporary manifestation. Those who have been loudest in their demands for the formation of élites, and most successful in forming such groups have been the totalitarians. Both Nazis and Fascists had their élite groups, and today the Communist parties everywhere claim they form an élite, only the name they give themselves is the "vanguard of the proletariat." The need for such an élite has been explicitly acknowledged by Communist ideologists, and at bottom the reason is identical with their opposition to parliamentary or representative democracy. Lenin declared at the time the Communists first split from the Socialists that the people could never be trusted to put through a fully Socialist program; they would give up at the first hardships. For that reason, he claimed, the Communists would have to form a "vanguard" to impose their program upon the people. Under this conception, leadership is imposed upon the people.

DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

Democratic practice and ideals are just the opposite. Instead of being imposed, leadership is expected to arise out of the people, and the problem of raising the quality of leadership has tended to be viewed as that of raising the standard of the whole people. John Quincy Adams, in many

ways the last of the Founding Fathers, gave expression to this view at the very beginning of the American democracy. According to his grandson, Brooks Adams, in his *Degradation of Democratic Dogma* (p. 104-5), it was his conviction that the success of democracy is dependent on producing an average among the whole people,

"which, if it did not attain to the eminent ability of the first President, might at least be capable of understanding and appreciating his moral attitude." Instead of trying to form élites to lead the people, with consequent distrust of them, democracy would thus seek to educate the whole people to produce their own leaders.



Voice of America

"Despite desperate efforts on the part of the Soviets to create interference, even cutting home stations off the air, some twenty-five per cent of the Voice of America programs are getting through. In short, the battleground at long last has been carried over to the Soviet Union itself. The power of truth is being set against the efficiency of the lie.

"The knowledge of truth can be a factor of overwhelming importance in the Soviet Union, where besides smaller minorities some 45,000,000 Ukrainians chafe in bondage. The picture of world conditions outside the iron curtain brought home to these enslaved peoples can radically affect a given Soviet internal condition in war or peace. Morale, tactics, strategy can be changed overnight because of the smouldering nationality problems as well as the unrest of the ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed Russians themselves. The Soviets cannot afford this one rent in the iron curtain."—UKRAINIAN BULLETIN, May 15, 1949.

"Go to the Workingman"

REV. JOSEPH F. DONNELLY

Chairman, Connecticut State Board of Mediation and Arbitration

*Reprinted from SOCIAL ACTION BULLETIN**

WATCHING what has happened during the last decade in Central Europe—and in France, Spain, Italy, Belgium and the rest—our minds turn continually to that shocking judgment of Pius XI: "*The working classes have been lost to the Church.*"

It is so terribly true in so much of Europe. And when we try to evaluate the tragedy of modern Europe, this sad fact must be included as a major factor of that tragedy.

But why did the Church lose so many of the working class? It was not because the Church did not offer the sacrifice of the Mass for them. It was not because the Church did not administer the sacraments to them. It was not because the Church did not visit their sick and bury their dead. Then why? Pius XI said it was because the Church did not stand shoulder to shoulder with them as they fought the injustices which kept the poor poor.

Many years before, Leo XIII had warned the Church that the condition of the working classes was "the pressing question of the hour" and that "some remedy must be found, and quickly, for the wretchedness and misery pressing down so heavily on the vast majority of the working classes." But forty years later Pius XI was repeating Leo XIII's injunction: "Go to the workingman, particularly where he is poor." And not the simple, respectful and tractable poor, but the poor who, "*because they were not treated with the respect to which they were entitled, in bitterness have strayed far from God.*"

POPES AHEAD OF TIMES

In reading the signs and sounding the warnings the Popes have been so far ahead of us! Twelve years ago in *Divini Redemptoris* Pius XI wrote: "Every other enterprise, however attractive and helpful, must yield before the vital need of protecting the very foundations of the Faith and Christian civilization."

And in the very next sentence: "Our parish priests therefore, while providing of course for the moral needs of the faithful, must dedicate the better part of their endeavors and their zeal to winning back the laboring masses to Christ and His Church. . . ."

But that was in 1937. Writing to Canon Cardijn of Belgium about

* Box 1224, New Haven, Conn., Feb. 15, 1949

a year ago, our present Holy Father Pius XII used these sober words:

The greatest danger to the Church today is that working people know nothing, absolutely nothing, of the social doctrine of the Church. The greatest danger is not Communism. That is but a consequence.

The greatest danger is the ignorance of the working people who need this truth, and who need the apostles of this truth.

All over the world, Catholics have still a big job ahead of them—the job of catching up with the Papacy. That will take much more effort than most of us are currently exerting.



Going to the Dogs

A Wisconsin man, answering the plea of his wife for a divorce from him, stated that he has led a dog's life ever since he married her.

Dog's life, indeed! If he meant by that that he had suffered cruel, inhuman treatment, he chose a poor simile.

A dog, as a rule, does not receive unkind treatment, no matter what be the station in life of his master. He eats and sleeps when he pleases and finds life quite different from that of dissatisfied humans about him. In short, he does not lead what some humans call a dog's life.

A dog may come from Greenland, Austria or Mexico, but he's usually a fairminded, loyal friend regardless of his nationality, and the smile of a Javanese spaniel is just as friendly as that of a Massachusetts spaniel.

"Things are going to the dogs" is another overworked expression. We might learn a lot if we went to the dogs, and copied some of their best traits.—*Father Solleder in the UNION AND ECHO, May 15, 1949.*

Editorials

Jerusalem

ACTING on the premise that possession is nine points of the law, the Israeli Government continues to insist that the city of Jerusalem is its national property. There is no doubt about the new State's determination to retain control of the city it has won by force of arms. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of Israel, in a recent address, promised that the Holy Places in the ancient city would be respected and agreed to "accept the fullest international safeguards and controls for their immunity and protection," but he and other officials of his Government refuse to back down from their claim to sovereignty over Jerusalem.

This stand is opposed not only by the Catholic Church but by many other individuals and organizations, including the United Nations, which as early as November, 1947, decided that the Holy City should be under international control. Such opposition in no sense can be construed as anti-Semitism. The quarrel is with the Israeli State, not with the Jewish people. If the charge of anti-Semitism is made, it can with the utmost justice be thrown back into the faces of the Israeli Government which has shown itself to be anti-Semitic by refusing to repatriate several hundred thousand Semitic Arabs, who were driven or frightened from their

homes in Palestine during Arab-Jewish hostilities.

It should be noted, too, that the Church is not taking sides in the Arab-Jewish struggle for political control of Palestine. The Vatican has most carefully avoided supporting either the Jews or the Arabs. It is concerned only with the religious aspects of this question—the safety, administration and accessibility of the Holy Places, shrines that are sacred to the whole Christian world. Nor does the Holy See deny the Jewish leaders' sincerity in promising to respect these shrines. It questions, however, whether the Jewish Government, whatever its sincerity, will be in a position to protect them. The Holy See recalls that its own safety and autonomy were endangered during the period between 1870 and 1929 when the Vatican was juridically a part of Italy and is convinced that the situation in Jerusalem presents several parallel features. Because the Vatican was freed from Italian sovereignty in 1929 by the Lateran treaty, it enjoyed the safety of neutrality during the past war. The Holy See feels that Jerusalem would be similarly protected only by placing it under international control.

Some newspaper articles give the impression that the Israeli Government has actually consented to internationalize Jerusalem. The confusion arises from an Israeli offer to

surrender to the UN the section known as the "Old City." Since this area is still held by Arab forces, the offer is scarcely generous. Despite propaganda that the section now in Israeli hands contains few important shrines, there are more than fifty such places in the "New City," including the Upper Room, Mount Zion, and Mount Scopus or the Mount of Olives. Only internationalization of the whole city and its environs will provide adequate protection for all the sacred shrines in or near Jerusalem.—CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH-REGISTER, *Cincinnati, Ohio*, May 13, 1949.

Facts of Life for Parents

IT WAS announced recently that head teachers of boys' and girls' high schools in Perth had approved of the showing to their pupils of films giving instruction on sex.

This move followed, presumably, upon similar activity in London, and is advocated by well-meaning people under the mistaken impression that the loose sexual morality of our days, especially among young people, is occasioned by sexual ignorance. "Definitely, the hush-hush about sex in the past has been wrong," said one headmaster. "It has led to children getting sex information in the gutter and by other undesirable means."

Now, in this respect, it should be noted that there has probably never been a time in history when sex knowledge was more frequently and widely diffused—by the printed

word, the spoken word and films and the radio. Moreover, the traditional Christian standards of sexual morality have either been so ignored or compromised that for one lacking a dogmatic faith it has become confusing to differentiate between what is decent and indecent both as to the knowledge received and to the medium of its reception. When birth-prevention, sterilization and artificial insemination are so widely accepted, it cannot be wondered at that the sexual standards of the nation as a whole are deplorably low.

Hence it is clear that, particularly in young people, evil practices are the effect not so much of ignorance of intellect as of weakness of a will exposed to dangerous occasions. In addition, there is a special danger arising from attempts at sex education in a secularist atmosphere. For mere will-power will not avail indefinitely to preserve chastity unless it is supported by the supernatural aids of grace. Naturalism is, unhappily, the insufficient background of the secularist philosophy, and in this instance is responsible for the dangerous assurance of those who imagine that the virtue of youth can be safeguarded by precautionary instruction based on vague idealism and dread of disease.

It is interesting to note that in the Australian Broadcasting Commission wiser counsels have prevailed on this subject. The chairman recently declared that "broadcast talks on sex, no matter how well-intentioned, are likely to do more harm than good."

That also was the conclusion reached by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on broadcasting in 1946. The view that sex education should be personal and individual, and is a parental responsibility, is in complete harmony with traditional Christian practice, and would avoid the arousing of morbid curiosity in the young.

There are obvious perilous effects to be anticipated from any attempt at mass instruction, particularly when imparted by a visual technique. Sex knowledge is a matter which should be imparted gradually and according to an intimate knowledge of the stage of development of each individual child. Mass instruction precludes this personal and gradual approach, and every teacher can bear witness to the harmful effects of sudden disclosures on immature and unprepared minds.

Moreover, sex knowledge can rationally be related only to marriage or to continence, and these matters cannot be considered purely or even primarily from the aspect of physical function. Spiritual and psychological considerations of the highest import are involved which cannot be treated in any adequate fashion by the visual technique. If it is true that parental obligation of imparting the facts of life has largely broken down, the obvious remedy is to start educating the parents in a technique of imparting such knowledge. It is too large a presumption altogether for the State or for individual teachers to undertake regarding other people's children in a matter where

great and irreparable harm may be done when enthusiasm outruns discretion.—THE RECORD, Perth, Australia, March 31, 1949.

Is Industry a "Family Affair"?

RECENTLY we saw a British film called "Family Affair." The general theme was that a factory should be modelled after the family. Industry, the film said, should be a family-like affair. The comparison is a good one—provided it is not misunderstood.

Some people get the idea that employees should look upon their employer as a father. In turn, they say, the employer should take a fatherly attitude toward his workers by treating them as he would his own children.

These same people then try to apply the Fourth Commandment, "Honor thy father and mother," to the relationship between a worker and his employer. The child (employee) should regard his parent (employer) with filial devotion and obedience.

All of this sounds a little too paternalistic to us. A little too feudalistic as well as unrealistic.

Workers, we believe, should be regarded primarily as adult human beings, not as children. In any factory or establishment, the worker and his employer cooperate together to produce goods and services. They work together for their own good and for the common good of all.

That is why we give a different

meaning to industry as a "family affair." *We like to compare the employer-employee relationship to the family bond between a husband and wife. A husband and wife depend upon each other and work out their happiness, not alone, but together. Can't the same thing be said about workers and employers?* Pope Leo XIII said that: "Capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital. Each requires the other."

Marriage is a partnership between two persons equal in dignity and worth. Business, too, should be a kind of partnership between capital and labor.

In his letter *On the Reconstruction of the Social Order*, Pope Pius XI said:

We consider it more advisable in the present condition of human society that, so far as is possible, the work-contract [between employers and employees] should be somewhat modified by a partnership contract as is being done in various ways and with no small advantage to workers and owners. Workers and other employees thus become sharers in ownership or management or participate in some fashion in the profits received.

Should business be a family affair? Yes and no; it all depends on what you mean.—WORK, *Chicago*, Ill. April, 1949.

Intellectual Pride

THE world's Saviour was set up for the ruin and the resurrection of many. His Church follows the same pattern.

If, as certain theologians have theorized, when God wished to test the fidelity of the newly-created angels, He gave them a vision of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity united to a human nature,—the dilemma faced by these spirits may be thus depicted:

Here they were, bright, beautiful, glorious, spiritualized, intellectual beings. Marvelous powers and eternal years were theirs, of that they had been assured. Now, however, they are asked to bow in adoration and later to be submissive to a new, strange and altogether inferior Being, which had the form of a man.

Love and loyalty to their Creator told the faithful angels that whatever God asked was good and wise and beneficial. But in the case of Lucifer and his imitators, self-love, pride, arrogance in the possession of their heavenly gifts impelled them to turn away from such adoration and service. What, bow down to such a creature as that? No, as rebel men nowadays would say: "It doesn't make sense."

There always has been and is today a class of men who pride themselves as "intellectuals." Since Pentecost, these are asked to adore a Crucified God, to confess their sins to a human being; they are told to do many other things which are the antithesis of human pride and passion. By their deeds, if not by their words, these too answer: "It doesn't make sense." For want of a better or briefer term, we call their crime "intellectual pride," imperfect though that expression may be.

To the proud, arrogant Jewish hierarchy, the acknowledgment of a Nazarene who taught self-denial and purity, to be the long-looked-for Messiah, just didn't make sense; to the intellectual lights of the Roman Empire the doctrines of purity, humility, charity of this oriental Prophet, just didn't make sense. So it has been through the ages and is today. Vast numbers of persons would reject true Christianity even though they understood it, would reject the Catholic Faith even though they did know its credentials, because of the higher truths which it teaches and the Christ-like virtues which it demands.

So even if Communism were obliterated, there would still be antagonism to Christ and to His religion because to those whom Christ called "the world" the Eight Beatitudes just don't make sense.—CATHOLIC SENTINEL, *Portland, Ore., Feb. 10, 1949.*

The Fundamental Conflict

WHEN history a century or more hence weighs, for good and for evil, the personalities of the mid-twentieth century, the likelihood is strong that the dominant figure will not be Roosevelt or Churchill, Hitler or Stalin, but Pope Pius XII. In his series of public utterances on our disordered day and age, he is voicing the ultimate issues in the fundamental conflict which is being waged, now as ever, between good and evil.

It is a communist illusion that the ultimate issues are economic. It is a democratic illusion that they are po-

litical. It is a common illusion that they are dogmatic, a conflict between a specific government and a specific Church that are antithetical. The basic truth is that the conflict is between a society based on the individual's personal dignity and freedom and the society where they are subordinated to the totalitarian state.

There is nothing new about the conflict. Rather it is universal in human history. The Athenians waged it against the Persians and the American colonists waged it against the British. Protestants and Catholics alike have waged it throughout the Christian era and the western world, and that conflict epitomizes the entire history of the Jew. In upholding the rights of his Church, the Pope upholds the inalienable personal rights of all mankind.

The fundamental conflict of our era is not between fascism and communism. Despite external and secondary differences, they are basically the same thing. Nor is it between them and democracy, if democracy be considered merely political and economic freedom for the individual. The basic freedom is moral freedom, with its corollary of individual moral responsibility. It is that individual moral responsibility, which we as Americans like to think of as American but in reality is a universal human heritage from God, which is in fundamental conflict with totalitarianism. This is the point which Pope Pius XII is bringing home to the world in his series of addresses.—BOSTON TRAVELER, *Boston, Mass., Feb. 23, 1949.*

Documentation

The North Atlantic Pact

Joint Statement of the World Order Committee and the Juridical Institutions Subcommittee of the Catholic Association for International Peace, May, 1949.

THE North Atlantic regional pact for joint defense of the United States, Canada and Western Europe seems necessary. It is consistent with the UN and may fill gaps in the UN. It should, in fact, have been entered into in some form years ago to fit long-standing realities of the North Atlantic countries. Accompanied by the present swift but difficult steps towards European economic and political unity—themselves magnificent—the Pact has already had good effects.

These committees urge its speedy ratification.

The present inadequacies of the UN to maintain international peace and security—due to the veto in the Security Council—require other means of adequate protection against aggression or armed attack. The North Atlantic Pact is a necessary step forward in this direction.

The North Atlantic Pact is consistent with the UN in that the UN provides for regional pacts, and for collective self-defense. Some have contended that a regional pact violates the idea of a world organization. The UN Charter itself takes no such position, and the American States, even before the UN was formed, took steps to form a far closer regional agreement than that of the regional North Atlantic Pact. In fact there should be no contradiction of

a world organization with regional organizations any more than with national governments. All three are needed and have to work together.

Others object that the Pact is a threat of aggression against Russia or, at least, that Russia will so consider it. Anyone who knows American, Canadian and West-European opinion could scarcely construe the Pact as anything but defensive. Now that the countries of this region are determined to work together in the pursuits of peace, their Atlantic Pact, although not yet in effect, has already had a salutary effect on the Soviet.

A change in the Soviet is necessary to save the UN. Every pressure of peaceful opposition to any Soviet aggression, every practicable move for world and regional peaceful cooperation, inclusive of Russia if she will enter or apart from her if she refuses, and such joint agreements on regional military defense as the Organization of American States or the North Atlantic Pact needed to wake up the Soviet to her dangerous policy, should be used.

The Atlantic Pact can, therefore, be a means of saving the UN.

We entered a pact in the UN for the defense of every country and we entered a pact for the joint defense of the Western hemisphere in the Organization of American States to solidify a

similar decision that we made alone, a century and a quarter ago, to defend the Americas from Western European aggression. However, in the North Atlantic old prejudices make some of us hesitate.

Yet for the last fifty years, our own well-being, the well-being of Europe, the prevention of two world wars and prevention of the Depression of 1929 largely depended upon Europe, Canada and the U.S. working together. In the Marshall Plan, in the drive for a United

Europe, in the continued use of the UN, and now in the Atlantic Pact, we are catching up somewhat with the facts.

The Atlantic Pact is only one part of a general plan. It is an essential part. The great hope is that through the success of these other methods there will never be need to use military action to defend Europe, Canada and the U.S. Meanwhile, in adopting the Atlantic Pact, let us employ and strengthen the UN and hasten the union of Europe.



Address to Catholic Employers

HIS HOLINESS, POPE PIUS XII

Address to 400 delegates to the Ninth International Congress of the International Union of Catholic Employers, assembled at the Vatican, May 7, 1949.

WITH equal solicitude and equal interest We receive the visits, in turn, of workmen and of the representatives of industry. Both of these groups lay their respective problems before Us, with a confidence that moves Us deeply. So in bidding you a very hearty welcome, dearly beloved sons, We gladly seize the opportunity you offer Us to assure you of Our paternal regard, and to commend the zeal with which you are laboring to permeate the economic world with Christian social doctrine.

COOPERATORS IN COMMON TASK

We have just made reference to the preoccupations of those who are engaged in industrial production. Mistaken and disastrous in its consequences is the prejudice, alas! too widely held, which sees in these problems an irreducible clash of rival interests. The opposition is only apparent. In the economic domain management and labor are linked in a community of action and interest. To disregard this mutual bond, to strive to break it, can only betray a pretention to blind and preposterous despotism. Employers and workers are not implacable adversaries. They are cooperators in a common task. They eat, so to speak, at the same table, seeing that they must live, in the last analysis, from the gross or net profits of the national economy. Each receives his income, and in this regard their mutual relations do not in any way imply that one is at the service of the other.

To receive one's wage is a prerogative of the personal dignity of anyone who makes his productive contribution in one form or another, as

employer or laborer, towards the output of the nation's economy. In the accounting of private industry salary-totals may be listed under costs to the employer. But in the national economy there is only one type of costs, which consists in the national resources utilized with a view to national production, and which must, in consequence, be constantly replenished.

From this it follows that both parties are interested in seeing to it that the costs of national production are in proportion to its output. But since the interest is common, why should it not manifest itself in a common outward expression? Why should it not be allowable to assign to the workers a just share of responsibility in the establishment and development of the national economy? Especially today when the scarcity of capital and the difficulty of international exchange are paralyzing the free flow of expenditure on national production? The recent attempts at socialization have only served to make this painful reality more clearly evident. It is a fact. Neither has it been created by the bad will of some, nor can the good will of others succeed in eliminating it. This being true, why not come to a decision now, while there is yet time, in full awareness of the common responsibility, so as to insure one group against unjust suspicions and the other against illusions which would become before long a social peril?

"OCCUPATIONAL ORGANIZATION"

Our Predecessor of imperishable memory, Pius XI, had suggested the practical and timely prescription for this community of interest in the nation's economic enterprise when he recommended in his Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* "occupational organization" for the various branches of production. Nothing, indeed, appeared to him more suited to bring economic liberalism under control than the enactment, for the social economy, of a public-law statute based precisely on the common responsibility which is shared by all those who take part in production. This feature of the Encyclical stirred up a host of objections. Some saw in it a concession to modern political trends, while for others it meant a return to the Middle Ages. It would have been incomparably more sensible to lay aside the flimsy prejudices of the past and to get down to work sincerely and courageously to make the proposal, with its many practical applications, a living reality.

But at present that part of the Encyclical would seem, unhappily, to provide us with an example of those favorable opportunities which are allowed to escape for want of being seized in time. Meanwhile feverish attempts are under way to work out other juridical types of organization for the social economy, and at the moment preference favors state enterprise and the nationalization of industry. There can be no question that the Church also admits—within certain just limits—state ownership and management, judging that "certain forms of property may legitimately be reserved to the public authority: those which represent a dominating power

so great that it cannot without danger to the general welfare be entrusted to private individuals" (*Quadragesimo Anno*). But to make of this state enterprise the normal rule for public economic organization would mean reversing the order of things. Actually it is the mission of public law to serve private rights, not to absorb them. The economy is not of its nature—not more, for that matter, than any other human activity—a state institution. It is, on the contrary, the living product of the free initiative of individuals and of their freely established associations.

It would be just as untrue to assert that every particular business is of its nature a society, with its personnel relationships determined by the norms of distributive justice to the point where all without distinction—owners or not of the means of production—would be entitled to their share in the property, or at the very least in the profits, of the enterprise. Such a conception stems from the assumption that every business belongs naturally within the sphere of public law. The assumption is inexact. Whether the business is organized in the form of a corporation or an association of all the workmen as part-owners, or whether it is the private property of an individual who signs a wage-contract with all his employees, in the one case as in the other it falls within the competence of the private-law discipline of economic life.

OBJECTIVE OF SOCIAL ECONOMY

All that We have just said applies to the juridical nature of the enterprise as such. But the business may involve a whole category of other personnel relationships which must be taken into account—even those of shared responsibility. The owner of the means of production, whoever he be—individual owner, workers' association or corporation—must always—within the limits of public economic law—retain control of his economic decisions. It goes without saying that his income is higher than that of his collaborators. But it follows that the material prosperity of the entire population, which is the objective of social economy, lays upon him, more than upon the others, the obligation of contributing by savings to the increase of the nation's fund of capital. As we must not forget, on the other hand, that it is supremely advantageous to a healthy social economy when this accumulation of capital derives from the greatest possible number of sources, it is very desirable, in consequence, that the workmen also should be enabled, by the fruit of their savings, to share in the creation of the capital resources of their country.

A great many business men like yourselves, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, have on repeated occasions expressly declared that the social doctrine of the Church—and that doctrine alone—is equipped to provide the essential elements for the solution of the social problem. Assuredly the reduction to practice and application of this doctrine cannot be the **work of a day**. Its realization requires of all participants in the process a discretion born of insight and foresight, a strong dose of good sense and

good will. It demands of them especially a radical reaction against the temptation to seek each one's own advantage at the expense of the other partners—whatever be the nature and form of their participation—and to the detriment of the common welfare. It calls finally for unselfishness of a sort which can only be instilled by an authentic Christian virtue, sustained and aided by the grace of God.

It is to draw down this aid and this grace on your Union, on its development from within and its influence on the world without, particularly in those countries which, for all their Catholicity, need nonetheless to give deeper consideration to the social thinking of the Church, that We impart to you from the depths of Our heart, for yourselves and for your Association, under the powerful patronage of the Mother of Divine Love, Our Apostolic Blessing.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.